



TITLE:

Newsletter : Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University No.65

AUTHOR(S):

CITATION:

Newsletter : Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University No.65.
Newsletter 2012, 65(Spring 2012): 1-30

ISSUE DATE:

2012-03-31

URL:

<http://hdl.handle.net/2433/180692>

RIGHT:

CSEAS



NEWSLETTER

**Center for Southeast Asian Studies
Kyoto University**

NO.65 | SPRING 2012



Contents

Appeal for an Area Informatics Approach to Area Studies Interview by Kobayashi Satoru, Assistant Professor Shibayama Mamoru	3
Looking Back over the G-COE Program “In Search of a Sustainable Humanosphere in Asia and Africa” Interview by Nishi Makoto, G-COE Assistant Professor Sugihara Kaoru	7
Studying ASEAN Regionalism: What Skillset Is Required? Anthony Milner	10
From Bangkok to Palembang: The Southeast Asian Games and a Cultural Approach to Studying Regionalism Simon Creak	15
Looking at the Past of the Mekong to Meet the Challenges of the Present Sunait Chutintaranont	18
Gamelan in the Blood Joss Wibisono	21
From Story to Shrine Chris Baker and Pasuk Phongpaichit	25
The Library as a Reflection of Southeast Asian History Kitamura Yumi	28
Publications, Visiting Fellows	30
Launch of New <i>Southeast Asian Studies</i>	31

Appeal for an Area Informatics Approach to Area Studies

Shibayama Mamoru, Professor CSEAS
ชิบายามา มาโมรุ

Interview by Kobayashi Satoru, Assistant Professor CSEAS

สารสนเทศของพื้นที่และเรื่องราว
การศึกษาเอเชียตะวันออกเฉียงใต้

Since the creation of the new field known as 'Area Informatics' (AI) Professor Shibayama Mamoru has been a leading figure in its development and its contribution to Japanese Area Studies, both within the Center for Southeast Asian Studies and further afield. Through a multidisciplinary framework that includes the historical formation of AI, Japanese area studies has fostered great interest in the lives of people living across the region. Through a focus on human interaction between the natural environment, agriculture, fisheries, religious cultural activity, modern states and the development of global capitalism, many different types of information have been collected and integrated. This has allowed researchers to analyze the conditions of human societies and their relation to the natural environment. Over the years, Prof. Shibayama has worked on creating a discipline that can deal with large volumes of information and this has created an approach that has been characterized by looking at how information is chronologically and spatially associated. Through this, past area studies researchers who conducted fieldwork and gathered information have been able to open up new possibilities to look into the data they have discovered paving the way to the creation of new 'regional knowledge.' This interview was conducted with Associate Professor Kobayashi Satoru and explores Prof. Shibayama's recollections of the development of his disciplinary approach over the years.

Kobayashi: You've been involved in Area Informatics (AI) for some time now, however I'd like to go back to when you were a student. Could you tell me what kind of reasons led you to take an interest in a discipline such as Information Science (IS)?

Shibayama: When I was a student in the late sixties, Japan didn't have digital computers nor were there disciplines such as Information Engineering or Computer Sciences. This was the age of mechanical calculators, the 'analogue' age. I used to make crystal radios and when I was an elementary school student I passed the radio operators national entrance exam. I wanted to work in the field of electronics. But, after entering university, my dreams went up in flames. In 1970, the protest against the revision of the Japan-US security Treaty and the University wars escalated, spreading beyond Ritsumeikan University to engulf Kyoto and Doshisha University. Unimaginable scenes such as demos were an everyday occurrence and clashes between students, bloodshed, the destruction of university buildings, and the obstruction of entry to exams continued for some time. From 1966 to 1969

courses couldn't be held but somehow I graduated in 1970. To this day, I have no idea how I graduated.

Kobayashi: Would you be able to tell me what was IS back then?

Shibayama: At the time, IS was a discipline that was logic circuitry, mathematical analysis and communication theory and was studied in electrical engineering faculties. And here, at Kyoto University, there were only a few courses that were taught at a handful of state-of-the-art research labs. At the time, the Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS) was targeted by campus rioters. I remember that the chants of the students in the federation of Students' Self-Governing Association were "resist the establishment of CSEAS, an institution in bed with U.S. imperialism." The reason for this hostility was that the Center had received \$350,000 from the Ford Foundation towards its establishment. I had no clue that after that, I would be going to work for the center at a later date.

Kobayashi: In 1983 you first joined the Center as an assistant professor. What were your first impressions of the Center and of the interests of other professors at the time?

Shibayama: I had no clue as area studies was then, a new territory for me. At the time the Center was mainly working in Don Daeng in Northeast Thailand¹ looking at rice culture and the lives of villagers. It was area studies done through agricultural science, anthropology and history. As someone who only knew computers, I felt like I was hemmed-in by all these other disciplines. However, under the guidance of then Prof. Ichimura Shinichi, I took an interest in researching the 'Southeast and East Asian 11 Country Economic Growth Simulation Model' and did an awareness survey of Japanese based at Japanese companies in both south and southeast Asia. I was then invited to do research development with the Nobel Prize recipient L.R. Craine. I was also employed as a short term JICA expert and sent to Indonesia's development bureau. It was around this time that I first encountered the Thai script. I thought "now this is interesting. Nobody has looked at the script from the perspective of information engineering." IS was then in its infancy.

Kobayashi: I was wondering, what kind of recollections do you have of your exchanges with past fellows, other colleague's research and the characteristics of the Center back then?

Shibayama: At the time the Center had some very powerful staff. Close colleagues such as Sakurai Yumio, Tanaka Koji, Momoki Shiro, Katayama Yutaka and so on. At one time, we had Aung San Suu Kyi and other fellows who became permanent staff. We used to hold a tea party every week and all staff would get together to meet. Our staff meetings were all in Japanese but we'd all get together and have some amazingly powerful discussions. Staff would get together every day for lunch. I think this kind of liaising was the driving force of the center. Every day we were having seminars and discussing the ins and outs of Southeast Asia; looking at the dichotomies between what were villages and what were cities. All I did was patiently listen to them. A few years passed after I'd developed my interest in, and research on the Thai language and it was at this time that I really believed that the time would come for IS to have a place at the Center. Through using IS we would be able to observe that which we hadn't been able to previously.

Kobayashi: One of the tasks that you had in your early days at the Center was a request from Prof. Ishii Yoneo to create a concordance of the Kotmai Tra Sam Duang or the Law of the Three Seals, a corpus of traditional laws compiled in 1805 by the order of King Rama I. This must have been a massive undertaking as it required you to create the fonts for the Thai script taking advantage of your expertise and IS. To do this you must have had to deepen your exchanges with researchers studying in Thailand and Thais themselves.

Shibayama: The creation of the Law of the Three Seals required the editing of texts written in Thai and to do so, I had to develop software that could read Thai. This meant that I had to go into the

"field" and get some basic knowledge. Without the Romanization of Thai characters, without knowing how to display them via the computers used in Thailand, and without learning Thai syllables, I couldn't develop software.

I was based at the Liaison office in Bangkok and at the time the taxi's had no meters. I had to negotiate and move around from places such as Sukhumvit to the Sahaviriya International Computer Center at Silom. I visited the libraries at Kasetsart and Thammasat Universities to learn how PCs operated in Thai and did research on bibliographic information. But, research didn't stop here. I looked at all the street signs, visited restaurants (in particular Japanese bars), read the signs, and took notes. And, of course I'd ask Thais to teach me their script. This was my starting point to know Thai society.

However, this did not give me any direct clues as to how to develop a Thai word processor. I didn't speak Thai at the time and so Prof. Yoshikawa Toshiharu would accompany me. In Japan I'd visit the Tokyo University of Foreign Languages and learn about printing technology used for ALA-LC Romanization tables. The development of a Thai word processor progressed after I started to embed Thai script into the LSI (Large Scale Integration) circuits at the heart of the PC. When I was doing this it reminded me of my love for electronic technology that I had had when I was younger.

Kobayashi: Joining the Center must have been the first time that you came into contact with interdisciplinary studies. What did you think of this at the time?

Shibayama: I had no idea, but in spite of not understanding what interdisciplinary research was, I did enjoy listening to everyone else's discussions. I remember thinking excitedly "what have I studied up until now?"

Kobayashi: What were other people who were at the Center doing back then? What influenced you?

Shibayama: First and foremost the Don Daeng Research project as it represented true interdisciplinary study. Also, economists studying global models of economic development; economic development theory; anthropologists studying village culture in the island straits of Indonesia; and political scientists researching Indonesia's political structure also influenced me. Back then we also had research that was looking at the hydrological balance of water in Thailand. This was the time when we established a division for literature in Southeast Asian languages and posts for foreign staff too.

Kobayashi: I guess at that time there must have been staff at the Center who felt that there was no need for computers and a reason for this maybe that the technology had yet to come of age. Could you tell me how you thought IS might play a role in the research of the then faculty?

Shibayama: As I mentioned, I had a feeling that the day would come where we'd need IS. There would be the introduction of IS in the disciplines that had not focused on using computers such

as anthropology, sociology, political science and history. IS would be able to contribute to clarifying the image that researchers had of the region. But, this wasn't just through technical aspects of IS. But, excluding Prof. Ichimura Shinichi and Prof. Ishii Yoneo, nobody wanted to talk about computers.

Kobayashi: You left the Center for a while to work elsewhere for 15 years before returning as a professor in 2002. You then came to head the then newly created division of informatics. The reaction of staff to IS and its methodology must have been quite different from that of past staff. When you came back to the Center what kind of place did you find it to be?

Shibayama: The Center had changed dramatically. We were blessed with a good computer environment. All staff had their own computers and we had internet. Yet, it wasn't clear how IS would be applicable to area studies. How could it help? With my colleagues, Hayashi Yukio, Kono Yasuyuki and Ando Kazuo we had many discussions to look for a way to apply it. Would we use IS and apply it to regional understanding? Or create databases? Could IS studies take area studies as the object of study? We looked at the different ways it could be applied.

Kobayashi: Since you came back to the center you have strongly put across three approaches towards what you call "Area Informatics." Firstly, this is gathering, organizing, integrating and sharing regional information. The second is the development of empirical area studies that introduces AI methods. And finally, the discovery of new knowledge through data mining. I'd like to ask you about the first. Could you explain what it is?

Shibayama: The first has three principle meanings: the sharing of information resources within the research process. If you need maps of research areas, satellite imagery, elevation and meteorological data, you need to search and obtain this information individually. For example, at the liaison office in Bangkok we have many maps (Scale 1: 50,000) in storage but they are not organized for use and you can't search through them from Kyoto. In other words you cannot share this valuable material. This is the same issue for Theravada Buddhist temples in mainland Southeast Asia and mapping the mobility of monks. We have a C.D. which is shared within a team that did research on this topic however, with the analysis process the data is merely processed secondarily. It's the same with visualization. It is difficult to share these kinds of processes within the team. You also need to consider this issue from the level of the center itself. When looking at a specific area, if you can look at the research data, primary data, research processes and results that other researchers have prepared, then can you see the whole picture of the process. However, this is easy to say, but difficult to put into practice...

The next issue is one for Southeast Asian Studies. For our Center (CSEAS), both in reality and name, we are not the leader in the field of SEA Studies. In order to do so we need to grasp the actual conditions of research being done in Southeast Asian nations. We also need to understand the state of the field in Japan, the U.S., surrounding nations and so on. Doing so will reflect back in our research, and lead to the call for us to play a greater

role in giving back to the research community. In order to do this we need good infrastructure for information, software and the creation of a network of personal contacts.

The final point is we need to prepare a framework that allows us to verify not just CSEAS' research processes, the informatization and distribution of our results, but also the 50 years of research that is available at the Center. For example, present staff are not interested in work which involves accumulating, sorting and integrating field notes, photos and other kinds of materials. And, the same level of disinterest applies to the creation of a database to do so. But, a partial effort has started here at the center.

Kobayashi: In regards to gathering, organizing, integrating and sharing regional information you applied and received a large amount of funding from the Japanese Ministry of Education for your Kiban (S) project "Creation of Area Informatics." The main objective of this was to unite the methodologies of AI into Area Studies. This was preceded by the H-GIS study group. Can you tell me more about how you brought together the members and the intention of the group?

Shibayama: Humanities GIS (Geographic Information System) was an attempt to introduce an AI analysis method that included spatial axes. Including these we hoped to find a new research methodology. In the humanities there is consensus over area studies. In sociology, AI has been introduced to many academic areas and that is because there is progress in empirical research. With my project I made a real attempt to use an empirically verifiable methodology through centering on spatial area informatics to look into the formation processes of Hanoi city, Vietnam. AI is not merely a tool, but a research area which allows us to ask "what have we learnt?" through a rigorous methodology.

Our project started from verifying a hypothesis that had previously been argued and we were able to observe two main results. The first one was we were able to carry out a highly accurate spatial analysis of the center of Hanoi and then, we were able to learn a number of new things. The first was the actual conditions of a failure in the urbanization and planning process, then the urban landscape in the French colonial period and its subsequent transformation, and finally Hanoi's transformation from village to city. These were all results which had not been previously explained. One other result was that we were able to conduct a high-resolution analysis and see 50 years of micro-topographical transformation. This research is still ongoing, but our final aim is to show that we can learn something through AI.

Kobayashi: I'd like to ask you about data mining. By comprehensively collecting and analyzing all the information from the societies we are studying, we can show the importance of the data mining method to discover knowledge. I don't think that area studies researchers understand that you visualize the descriptions in sentences of the data embedded in Excel files or that there is a technical theory for associating this in a temporal-spatial scale. This term is abstract and for some difficult to understand. Could you give some concrete examples of how AI can be applied to area studies using a data mining method?

Shibayama: Data mining is about finding regularities in massive amounts of data. In IS, the keyword that is used to target say, a text population that accumulates in a computer, allows us to see in what kind of context words are used. This is one representative example of searching for regularity. In regards to this method, area studies researchers use it implicitly on a daily basis. However, when asked about the evidence, a quantitative explanation remains impossible. For example, when you consider that the mobility of Buddhist monks in Theravadian Buddhist societies is different from the regularities that can be seen in Northeast Thailand and the autonomous prefecture of Dehong Dai in Yunnan province, you ask yourself what is (and to what degree), different? Where can we see the characteristics of the differences? Through a quantitative approach or with qualitative data these differences become easier to understand. Data mining adds scientific foundations to our understanding.

Through using computers, data mining makes it an extremely fast to process and target large amounts of information that are beyond our human capacity to process. But to do mining, you have to put the data into computers. That includes saving the uniformity of words, expressions and values. In the narrowest sense of its meaning, data mining is an example of discovering the regularities in previous words, but if we broaden its meaning it can allow us to discover regularities in the behavior of people in Theravada Buddhist societies. This is what I've been trying to do.

Kobayashi: I want to know about the future direction of Area Studies. Do you any idea about what direction we are heading in?

Shibayama: That's a difficult question. What we do now is very different to what we did 25 years ago. However, we are moving forward and everyone can travel to the field. And, what is required from us is a pioneering spirit. I think that there are three things we should keep in mind. Firstly, research that focuses on regions (that is cultural spheres within them) such as Prof. Hayashi's wide ranging research on Theravadian Buddhist societies. The second is research that focuses on Asian cities. In our 25 years of history we don't have any examples of urban studies. And the third is research into a sustainable humanosphere. What is also important is that we structure CSEAS' network and show where our core is.

Kobayashi: What kind of forum for discussion do we need to talk about the continuity of the development of AI in CSEAS?

Shibayama: I think that it's a point of discussion to ask what AI should be. What is important for us is that CSEAS requires that we produce examples of what AI can show in terms of understanding regions through the introduction of an IS methodology. To do that we need a discussion that entails looking over what is different and what we can understand through the approaches that I have discussed here.

Kobayashi: Finally, would you mind telling me where your

interest in people lies?

Shibayama: For the past 25 years I have been travelling to Thailand. I came to understand how different cultures and lifestyles can be. At the same time, I came into contact with dynamic living conditions. This continues till today. This is because I was able to come into touch with people who go against my computer orientated research. In some respects, studying technology can leave you feeling empty. Even if the light shines through on high tech research, in an instant, 10 years have passed, we are on Project "X" and all we are left with is looking back at the glories of the past.

However people form the basis for endless research. Syllable formation in Thai, machine translation research, software that decodes and recognizes the brush strokes of characters and old manuscripts are not merely about technology to think with, but part of how we behave. If you think about how we perform recognition, it is research itself that becomes something that studies humans; research that objectifies our behavior. Understanding this allows us to replace the "scripts" that permit us to study Man, from fieldwork through to technical research. And, that is where I think my roots are.

(Translation by Mario Lopez)

Notes

¹ An overview of this project can be found in *CSEAS Newsletter* 62, 7-8.

Looking Back over the G-COE Program “In Search of a Sustainable Humanosphere in Asia and Africa”

An Interview with Professor Sugihara Kaoru,
Convener of G-COE Program

Interview by Nishi Makoto
G-COE Assistant Professor

Assistant Professor Nishi Makoto first met Professor Sugihara Kaoru in 2007 when he was employed to work under the auspices of the G-COE program “In Search of a Sustainable Humanosphere in Asia and Africa.” In this interview he discusses the results of the project and goes over Professor Sugihara’s personal trajectory and his reflections on what has been achieved.

Nishi: Your field of expertise is economic history and you have done ample research in this area. What areas were you most active in and what have you achieved in this field? Also, how has your research informed or been informed by your present research agenda here at the Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS) within the G-COE program?

Sugihara: My career was built around the formation of a new field of research, which is the history of intra-Asian trade. In 1984, I organized a plenary panel for the Annual Meeting of the Socio-Economic History Society of Japan, under the theme of the trading world of Asia, with Kirti N. Chaudhuri (then SOAS), Hamashita Takeshi (then The University of Tokyo) and Kawakatsu Heita (then Waseda University). I argued that Asia, unlike Latin America and Africa, responded to the Western impact as a region connected through a web of trading networks, and that the persistence of this regional dimension played a crucial role in Asia’s industrialization and modernization. Partly through the encounter on this occasion, I left the Faculty of Economics of Osaka City University to take up a position at the Department of History, SOAS, in 1985. For the next 11 years I taught Japanese economic history there, shifting the basis of my teaching and research entirely to English. In London I was actively engaged in organizing workshops and editing conference volumes on Asian and global economic history. If I am asked what my most notable contribution to the field of economic history has been, I would say that it would be my role in pioneering a new field of research that has inspired both Japanese and English academic communities.

Prior to my appointment in 2006 at the Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS), I had never dreamt of doing anything like the G-COE project, never mind becoming the convener of it. Looking back, however, I feel that my 11 years of experience in Britain has helped me meet the challenge. I suppose I have trained myself as an academic who can operate in a ‘diasporic’ environment, pursuing arguments and debates without making assumptions that prevail in certain disciplines or languages only. In 1993, I joined a very small group of global history researchers, consisting of people based in London and Cambridge, and since then became involved in various international research networks of global history. The brain-storming sessions at the initial stage included heated discussion with those scientists who tried to persuade us of the utility of the Darwinist principle for the study of history, and a series of dialogues on the comparison between England (or Europe) and Japan with scholars such as the historical anthropologist Alan McFarlane and cultural historian Peter Burke. It is the conversations with these people that often came to mind when I became engaged in the formulation of G-COE paradigm. In Britain, I often felt unable to respond to a number of intellectually challenging issues, which made me feel frustrated, but looking back from 2012, I might say that I came back to Japan, with so many important questions stored deep in my head.

Nishi: The G-COE project has been an amazingly diverse one which has been spread across many disciplines, and many of the results have been scrutinized to see how they answer questions pertaining to a ‘sustainable humanosphere.’ This has been quite a challenge for all. Looking back over the four years what were

the hardships and the rewards that you encountered?

Sugihara: Hardships encountered pale, if I set them against rewards. I feel I am so lucky, and wholeheartedly appreciate the responses from all project members. All I could offer was my expertise in economic history, an ability to engage in the paradigm formulation, and the experience of international collaborative research. I am not an area studies specialist, nor did I have any experience of organizing research such as G-COE, which so fully encompasses the humanities, social sciences and science. Although I am a graduate of Kyoto University, I had little knowledge of the University's present personnel resources or its administrative system. Almost all the mobilization of appropriate resources was carried out by other core members of the project, led by Professor Kono Yasuyuki at CSEAS who acted as the Head of Administration and Professor Kawai Shuichi at the Research Institute for Sustainable Humanosphere (RISH).

However, what surprised me most was the response of the researchers who were employed in the G-COE program. In spite of the fact that the subject matter that they were asked to deal with is so interdisciplinary that their research wouldn't be immediately appreciated by specialists in their own fields, they took a real interest in the program and worked extremely hard. In part, this might be because they were placed in a diasporic environment, similar to mine in London, in the sense that each of them was on their own, unprotected from their disciplinary training and familiar jargons. I believe that this is necessary if we want to create a more universal form of knowledge, and that what we have gone through is a worthwhile exercise. All the same, the commitment these researchers have made must have required courage. I am proud that such a collective intellectual endeavor became possible in Japan, and especially at Kyoto University.

Nishi: To be honest, it took me quite some time to absorb the concept of a 'sustainable humanosphere' and I was quite confused as to how I could relate to it at the beginning of the project. However, looking back at my efforts to engage with the tasks you gave me, I finally found a place for myself within the project's remit. While in-charge as the convener, I was wondering what kind of theory or thinking you had towards the younger members of the project?

Sugihara: My first impression of you was that you had a very good training in dealing with written source materials and debates among the field researchers, but it took some time before I understood where your intellectual drive comes from. I am sure that this was partly due to the limits of my capacity. After I had long conversations with you and read your blog, I realized that your interest is not confined to African area studies, and that, through your fieldwork in Ethiopia, you have developed a serious interest in the understanding of the 'intimate sphere' with the use of social science concepts.

This year, I'm 63 and it is obvious that I am expected to guide younger researchers. In fact, however, there were few opportunities where I could use my technical ability for guidance or supervision in this project. On the other hand, when it comes to the formulation of the paradigm, 'leading' or 'guiding'

others is not really a useful frame of mind. As many distinguished American scholars practice, the right frame of mind is that from the outset, all should be treated equally, and that the winner of the group is a person who learns more from their interactions than others, regardless of his or her position in the organization or hierarchy. This is not easy to do, so whether or not I was actually able to do this is another matter.

Nishi: Through project discussions, one very important theme arose, that which pertains to a theory and practice of care that bears in mind intergenerational care and care for the sick. When I first started a family, I had the chance to ask myself what does it mean to care for someone, and it was the first time in my life that I had this opportunity to really think about the issue. As such, I become very involved in this topic. Theories relating to care essentially deal with issues surrounding relations between individuals. I think that there would be quite a few people who would raise an eyebrow at the fact that you, a professor working in the field of global economic history with many achievements, would take an interest in care related issues. Could you explain how your own involvement in the key term 'human existence' on the G-COE project, is connected to your interest in care?

Sugihara: If I am allowed to say a little about my personal life, my interest in care also arose from the experience of raising children. I married an Irish national and raised two children in Japan and the U.K. However, I divorced when they were 9 and 11, something that greatly pained me. Yet, even if we couldn't be together, I wanted to fulfill my role of 'spiritual parenthood' until they at least graduated from university. My son told me he wanted to have a stable family and he became a doctor. My daughter, working for a secondary school in London, is involved in the support of poor youth from Asia. Most of my own images of care are directly related to my encounter with hospices, social and charity work and other extracurricular activities I have been involved in while raising my children.

Nishi: I also have a great interest in medical anthropology and recently, at the invitation of a graduate student at ASAFAS, I took an interest in public health interventions that target day laborers in Kamagasaki, Osaka City. While going through materials relating to the topic it came to my attention that you edited a book that deals with the economic history of the urban poor in Osaka. Would it be right to venture to say that this contribution was also related to your interest in human existence or human conditions?

Sugihara: Osaka City University, where I was first employed, was noted for its longstanding research on social issues, with a center for the study of Buraku Liberation, as well as a keen interest in Korean residents in Japan. In the 1980s I published two edited volumes in collaboration with my then colleague, Professor Tamai Kingo, *Global Capitalism and Non-white Labour* and *The Slums of Osaka in Taisho Era*. These projects were carried out mostly by young researchers, and we were anxious to show our findings, especially how full the slum dwellers' lives were. We were able to receive a comment from an expert who studied

of the lower strata of Japanese society and he mentioned that the Osaka volume depicted the vibrancy of labourers and their lives better than previous studies. I remember that we wanted to write, not only about issues relating to their standards of living, but also their motivation to live their lives and the emotional ups and downs behind them.

Nishi: That leads me to ask how does the term 'human existence' relate to the field of economic history?

Sugihara: In 2009, when my father, Sugihara Shiro passed away at the age of 89, I wrote a short essay titled "Production and Human Existence (*seizon*)" in a journal which carried a special issue for the commemoration of his death. He was a historian of economic thought who worked on Karl Marx, John Stuart Mill and Kawakami Hajime among others. He also wrote on the themes of economic philosophy such as the meaning of the economy and the relationship between economy and life course. While classical economists established the principle of the political economy by placing 'production' at the center stage, critical students of this school, including Marx and Mill, felt that such an approach would never allow us to understand the nature of society in totality. The production paradigm was intended to show the direction of 'moral and material progress,' which was happening in England in the first half of the 19th century. To their critics it did not show the direction of human history in the long run. Economic history in the narrow sense usually deals with the development of the capitalist economy, which was discussed by classical economists through Keynes to neoclassical economists, and provides a historical understanding necessary to formulate contemporary economic theory and policy. However, we also need to broaden our perspective, if we are to deal with issues, such as environmental sustainability, that requires consideration of a much longer time frame as well as a much wider scope of enquiry. Looking at history not from the perspective of production, but from one of human existence, is therefore not an offence to the discipline. Rather it is an essential paradigm shift, if economics as a social science is to contribute to answering broad, long-term and global questions.

Nishi: As disciplines which hold the potential to radically criticize our world, political philosophy, gender studies and cultural anthropology can operate as various types of area studies. What do you think is the appeal of global economic history as a discipline that can offer critical thinking on issues?

Sugihara: When I was at Harvard University from 2003 to 2004 I suddenly received a mail from Andre Gunder Frank (1929-2005) and we had an opportunity to meet in Boston. We exchanged hundreds of mails during the two years in which he heroically struggled in the face of cancer and we had a fierce discussion regarding some parts of a sequel to his book *Reorient: Global Economy in the Asian Age* (1998). Frank gave many of us the impression of a public speaker standing in the Hyde Park Corner rather than that of a professor; a uninhibited, liberal, loud and insistent thinker-cum-performer. Karl Polanyi (1886-1964) another thinker who greatly influenced me, was also able to mix

with contemporary intellectuals, but worked as a journalist and taught at places such as the Workers' Educational Association in London. The ideas these people conceived remain central to the study of global history, and they did not come out of the establishment. Whether society is able to offer freedom of speech and freedom of thought to those intellectuals who question common sense, and whether it can treat them with tolerance, is a vital element in determining the quality of your discipline.

Nishi: Is there anything we can expect from future area studies being done at Kyoto University?

Sugihara: I've heard some of my younger colleagues at CSEAS complain that senior professors have their own disciplines but don't teach them to area studies students. They say that it is unfair that younger researchers are encouraged to do fieldwork, and when it comes to presenting their work, they are criticized for lacking a firm standpoint. My response to this is that disciplines are necessary. Of course, in comparison to working in specialized departments, your expertise tends to get watered down while engaging in fieldwork or interdisciplinary studies, and it becomes a challenge to keep up with what is going on in your original discipline. However, you have to do your best to stay with it, as 'feeding in' disciplinary information in this way is an essential contribution to area studies. In comparison to other institutions I think that area studies at Kyoto University have a rich experience in this respect.

We need to continue our effort to create new forms of knowledge by integrating as wide a range of disciplines of humanities, social sciences and sciences as possible. To do so, we have to enhance our capacity to integrate the fields that are so specialized that it has not been possible to bring in interdisciplinary endeavors so far. While it is true that vital inspiration often comes from what you see and feel in your fieldwork, as far as how to organize and structure your findings is concerned, you basically need the same procedure as found in other disciplines. If we can master that, then I think that area studies has great potential to produce original ideas and findings. The fact that we study the societies that are very far from our everyday reality should work to our advantage.

Nishi: Finally, do you have any final message for graduate students of researchers at the beginning of their careers who are aiming to do area studies?

Sugihara: What worries me most is whether your intellectual appetite matches that of my generation who started out in a poorer environment. At present, researchers are guaranteed one of the world's best research environments. We therefore should be able to lead international research on area studies. Don't rest on your laurels. When you try to think of something original, your points of reference should not be the knowledge of your supervisor, nor should they be what is known in area studies. Search the world's intellectual reservoirs, past and present, and try to put forward an idea that no one has ever thought of.

(Translation by Mario Lopez)

Studying ASEAN Regionalism: What Skillset Is Required?

Anthony Milner*

Former Visiting Research Fellow CSEAS
Basham Professor of Asian History, Australian National University

Academic interest in ASEAN is on the rise, along with a growing focus on regionalism and regionalisation¹ in general – and it is time to give more attention to the skillset required for deeper analysis. In both Australia and Japan there is a strong policy imperative helping to drive this interest in region, but research continues to be dominated by economists and security/international-relations specialists who tend to pay little attention to perspectives developed in the humanities, or area studies. Even the usual language of analysis employed in examining regions conveys a certain limitation and confusion in research perspective. Extending the study of region building beyond the established economics and security discourse seems all the more important today as we speculate about what an ‘Asian century’ might entail. To speak of a shift in economic and strategic power from West to East is one matter, but the task of predicting what structural transformations this might bring is one that must be a multidisciplinary endeavour.

The story of ASEAN has often been told – the founding in 1997, the move from 5 to 10 member states, the role of ASEAN in a wider ‘East Asian’ regionalism, and the way the organization has dealt with a number of regional challenges. It is predictably the functionalist capacity of such regional endeavours that tends to get most attention in scholarly commentary. Partly because of this, ASEAN has been subject to a good deal of criticism: many journalists are said to find it boring (Kavi 2011: 39); it is often dismissed as a ‘talk shop’; it is faulted for not having developed strong institutions in the way the European Union has done; it is described as slow-moving in making decisions, placing too much stress on achieving consensus; the member states are so concerned about defending national sovereignty, we are told, that initiatives to build real cooperation, or to bring reforming change to a specific recalcitrant ASEAN country are inevitably ineffective. Instances of ASEAN’s failures are often listed – the seeming inability to solve the ‘haze crisis’ of 1997–98 (when smoke from forest fires in Indonesia and East Malaysia spread across a large area of Island Southeast Asia); the limited response to the 1999–2000 Timor upheaval; the hesitation of the organization in confronting human rights issues in Myanmar; the slowness in creating an ‘economic community’ (scheduled to be in operation by 2015) (see, for example, Cotton 2006). The type of questions asked about ASEAN and its broader East Asian processes are: do they amount to a “sustainable and successful strategy for creating wealth?” or for “coping with security threats and promoting stability” (to cite two recent, succinct formulations) (Frost 2008: 18).

An issues-based, problem-solving perspective on ASEAN and other regional institutions has obvious advantages

– especially considering the scale of the security, economic, environmental and other challenges operating at present. Neglecting the area context, however, runs risks. To take some recent examples, it can lead to an underestimation of the difficulties of incorporating the American alliance system into the new, ‘Asian’ architecture (Bisley 2009: 115); and there has been disappointment on Australia’s part in campaigning for the creation of a new institution, an ‘Asia Pacific Community’. The Australian proposal (made in 2008) seemed sensible in functional terms – it called for a “regional institution that spans the entire Asia-Pacific region” and would be able to engage in the full spectrum of political, security and economic issues (Asia Society 2008) – but took insufficient account of ASEAN and other Asian perceptions regarding the issue of what a ‘regional community’ ought to entail. This omission, it would seem, arose at least in part from a skillset problem.

To be fair, international-relations specialists have shown a degree of flexibility in their approach to regionalisation. For a start, they have not always ignored the strengths of ASEAN – noting, for example, the achievement of reconciliation with Communist Vietnam and Laos, and ASEAN’s broader success in helping to maintain stability in a region where old rivalries and contested border areas might bring frequent and serious war. Some IR people have also identified the analytical gap I am concerned about – the area context gap that is often apparent in investigations of ASEAN and other, wider regional institutions in Asia. The importance of “regional awareness and regional identity” has been flagged (Wunderlich 2007: 138); and the phrase ‘cognitive regionalism’ invoked, explaining that it is “principally socio-cultural in analytical orientation” (Higgott 2007: 80, 83, 88). Amitav Acharya has been a leader in showing how institutions can be producers and enforcers of shared norms, which in turn can give substance to regional identity (Acharya 2009a). In a relatively rare initiative in interdisciplinary cooperation, he has also reached out to Southeast Asian studies – particularly the historiography of the region – to examine the way norms and ideas have been reformulated by ASEAN ‘norm entrepreneurs’ (Acharya *ibid.*; Milner 2010).

Despite such instances of sensitive research, however, even the language which IR and security studies specialists usually employ to assess regionalization conveys the methodological problem. The phrase ‘regional architecture’ is used time and again, but the analytical terminology that tends to be employed is more that of engineering than architecture. We read of ‘interlocking mechanisms,’ ‘efficacy indicators,’ ‘functionally distinct mechanisms,’ ‘design faults,’ ‘intelligent design’ and so forth. By contrast, the concerns of architecture – at least as I

understand them – are broader, more holistic. The architect aspires to integrate structures within their environmental, cultural and sociological contexts. From an engineer's perspective, a bridge design that has proved to be sound in Brazil might be adopted with equal success in Malaysia; but an architect will want to take a range of sociological and aesthetic considerations into account when sketching out a plan for a prominent public building in Malaysia (or Brazil) (Milner 2011: 121-122). The analogy here with 'regional architecture' seems particularly apt, underlining the vital importance of area context in building regional institutions.

In what specific ways, then, can area studies assist international relations in the study of region, and regionalisation? From time to time there have already been valuable interventions from sociologists, historians and others. The Institute of Malaysian and International Studies (IKMAS) at the National University of Malaysia, for instance, has published two volumes on regionalism. Here Wang Gungwu has written of the progress of a "sense of We-ness" in ASEAN (2006: 68-70). Sumit Mandal has pointed to the contribution of the arts – for instance, the ASEAN Film Festival and the Arts Network Asia and Asian Contemporary Theatre Collaboration (where active collaboration is promoted). "Crafting a regional identity in theatre," Mandal suggests, may be "part and parcel of the need to mobilize cultural, social, political and economic resources to mitigate, at the least, the worst effects of globalization" (2008: 176). In Singapore, Kumar and Siddique (influenced by sociology) have acknowledged the work of the ASEAN Committee on Social Development – in areas such as health, education and women's welfare – and also the initiative of the ASEAN People's Assembly, which brings together a range of NGOs and grass-roots organizations (Kumar and Siddique 2008: 78, 97). They note that a further dimension of ASEAN region building is Track II networking – particularly of the ASEAN-ISIS (ASEAN Institutes of Strategic and International Studies).

Despite these observations, however, when Kumar and Siddique stand back to make a judgment, they are not optimistic about the creation of a "supra-national, ASEAN-wide common identity" (*ibid.*: 232). There is "no common element that binds" the Southeast Asian region (*ibid.*: 35). While many citizens of the European Union have begun to "identify themselves as 'European' ... it will be some time before residents of this region identify themselves as 'Southeast Asian'" (*ibid.*: 31). English, of course, is the "common working language" of ASEAN, but it is a "language of pragmatism, not an emotive common language that can express any regional cultural content" (*ibid.*: 231). As well as the multiplicity of religious traditions, no common political and legal culture unites ASEAN's different peoples: only Singapore and Malaysia, for instance, possess similar legal systems (*ibid.*: 95).

Searching for a 'glue' that might help bind the ASEAN member states, and assist the "evolution of an ASEAN identity" (Siddique and Kumar 2003: 472), some commentators (especially economists) stress economic integration most of all, and argue that ASEAN regionalism is characterized by "network-based integration," while the European Union exemplifies "institution-based integration" (Eliassen and Arnesen 2007: 207,



Australia and New Zealand Engaging with the Influential Network, ASEAN ISIS (Author seated in the middle).

211). For area specialists, as I have suggested in discussing what 'architecture' really means, the significance of the cultural (or ideological) dimension in the building of a sense of 'We-ness' is likely to be obvious – and a range of academic disciplines bring perspectives that can help here. One important initiative is the recent focus on the study of regional networks, which is innovative in the way it seeks liberation "from the straitjacket of the modern 'nation-state,' be it colonial or national in its design" (Goscha 1999: 4). Christopher Goscha, for instance, has examined regional networks within which Vietnamese revolutionaries operated during the French colonial period, and has noted as well the different conceptualizations of region that were developed by these Southeast Asians (*ibid.*). A number of recent essays by Caroline Hau (one with Takashi Shiraishi) also focus on 19th and 20th century networks, and explore episodes in inter-Asian personal interaction (including between Anglo-Chinese), together with a range of "thought-experiments" concerning Asian solidarity (Hau and Shiraishi 2009; Hau 2011). "Asianism," suggest Hau and Shiraishi, "can best be understood and studied as a network formed through intellectual, physical, emotional, virtual, institutional and even sexual contexts, or some combinations thereof" (Hau and Shiraishi 2009: 332).

The historians O.W. Wolters and Anthony Reid, in their very different ways, have sought to give the region – as against merely its constituent states or communities – some sense of historical unity, sharpening awareness too of some common sociological features. The task of establishing substance of this type is challenging, because contrasts in the historical experience of different parts of Southeast tend often to be striking. The mere fact of an ASEAN conversation about history, however, may assist the development of a sense of 'We-ness' – may contribute to and not merely examine the process of regionalisation. It has been argued that in the European case such a 'regional conversation' – one in which the acknowledging of difference can be as significant as the marking of commonalities – has helped to promote a sense of regional identity, and it has the potential to do so in ASEAN as well (Pagden 2002; Milner 2003; Tarling 2006: 226). Some international-relations specialists, including Acharya, have been attentive to the manner in which regional conversation has assisted the formation of a regional diplomatic

culture in ASEAN – in particular, the ‘ASEAN way,’ defined by one Singapore Foreign Minister as ‘informality, organization minimalism, inclusiveness, intensive consultations leading to consensus and peaceful resolution of disputes’ (Tarling 2006: 184). What may become of increasing interest in the future is a broader, less elitist deliberation on what an ASEAN regional community and identity might entail. The fact that the forming of an ASEAN ‘Socio-Cultural Community’ – announced by the organization in 2003 – is intended to foster “regional identity as well as cultivate people’s awareness of ASEAN”² suggests that such a deliberation cannot be avoided.

The first-order importance of investigating the cognitive and emotive substance of the region is underlined by a research project at the Australian National University. Focusing on ‘security languages,’ this project brings security and international-relations practitioners into dialogue with specialists on political cultures and linguists, and one of its concerns has been the way ‘region’ is perceived (and felt). The decision to probe perceptions of ‘region’ was influenced partly by concern about the negative way in which the 2008 Australian proposal for an ‘Asia Pacific Community’ was received in most Asian countries. It is particularly through examining ‘key terms’ that we can gain some access to affective states as well as specific cultural orderings (Karim 1990: 60; Rosaldo 1980), and this consideration supported the examination of exactly how ‘region’ is understood in different Southeast Asian languages.

At the outset, the project researchers noted former Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir’s view that Australia and New Zealand could not be appropriate members of an East Asian community: they were “Europeans, they cannot be Asians.” They could offer “nothing,” he added, to a proposed “East Asian Community” (*Sydney Morning Herald*, Dec 7, 2004). When Mahathir contemplated the future development of regional architecture in Asia it is clear he was not merely taking into account the practical, functional purposes of these institutions. In the Malaysian foreign policy establishment discussion tends to be in English, so an analysis of the terminology employed in describing the idea of a regional community is less urgent. What a Google search does confirm, however, is that the Malay terms used to refer to ‘region’ – ‘kawasan’ and ‘rantau’ – are used more frequently with reference to Southeast Asia (Asia Tenggara), ASEAN and Asia than to the Asia Pacific (Asia Pasifik) or APEC. This may imply that ‘Asia’ and ‘Southeast Asia/ASEAN’ are likely to come to mind more readily as regions than the ‘Asia Pacific’ (or the APEC geographic sphere) – a consideration that must sharpen the challenge for those promoting ‘Asia Pacific’ regionalism, including the concept of an ‘Asia Pacific Community’ (APC).

Responses to the Australian ‘APC’ proposal in Indonesia also offer insights into thinking about ‘region’ in Southeast Asia. Here, where again the proposal failed to attract support, the APC was referred to as ‘Komunitas Asia Pasifik’ (*Republika* Jul 5 2001). In a sense this terminology made ambitious claims – and ones relatively easy to reject. The word ‘komunitas’ tends to be used at the local level, and carries the idea of genuine interpersonal bonds. In certain quarters there is said to be a longing for a new sense of ‘komunitas’ to replace the socialism that some felt provided that reassurance in the past. Even in the case of ASEAN

the claim of ‘komunitas’ is not made: rather ASEAN is merely described in Indonesia as a ‘kawasan.’ As in Malaysia this term suggests ‘region’ partly but not entirely in the physical, geographical sense. ‘Kawasan’ does seem to refer to people as well as territory, and there has been considerable discussion about “identitas kawasan” (regional identity) – discussion which focuses on cultural or spiritual underpinnings. Although ‘kawasan’ would appear to make a weaker claim than ‘komunitas,’ neither the APC nor APEC is described as a ‘kawasan.’ This raises the question as to whether the concept of ‘Asia Pacific’ conjures up much sense of a specific entity – of a defined physical unity or, for that matter, social unity.

In Thailand too there are signs that a real regional community would be expected to carry a degree of emotive meaningfulness. As Prapat Thepchatree explained at a Thai official seminar on regionalism in 2010, one of the criteria for determining what institution might be placed at “the core of regional architecture” is whether it possessed the “potential to develop into a regional community.” He went on to propose that “a common identity” was most important in bringing about such a community, and that there also had to be social and cultural as well political and economic cooperation among member countries. In the APC, judged Prapat, cooperation “would not be seen as meaningful and concrete.” Like APEC, he said, the APC would “lack a common identity” (Thepchatree 2010: 11-13).

The Thai terminology used with reference to different regional institutions – actual or proposed – may be significant here. ‘Asia Pacific Community’ has tended to be translated as ‘prachakhom esia paesific’ – though the Thai press gave very little attention to the Rudd APC proposal. The proposal by the then Japanese Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama ‘East Asian Community’ – which was advocated approximately a year after the Australian one – was translated as ‘prachakhom esia tawan-ok.’ The term ‘prachakhom’ is quite a new one, and suggests ‘community’ in a more abstract sense, rather than a ‘local neighbourhood.’ For a period it also carried the idea of ‘society,’ and the formative element ‘pracha’ does at least hint at the sense of an organic community – of a grouping whose members are in some type of communicative relationship with one another (Navavan 1999: 379). To have referred to either the APC or the EAC ideas in terms of ‘prachakhom,’ therefore, would have raised an expectation that they should possess some element of organic community. The challenge might be expected to have been greater for the APC – if only because the ‘Asia Pacific’ is not often described by Thais as a region (*phumiphak*). By contrast, there is often mention of the ‘Asian region’ (*phumiphak esia*) or ‘East Asia region’ (*phumiphak esia tawan-tok*) (e.g. Matichon Sutsapda, Oct 23-29, 2009: 47).

If we turn to the language used in Thailand to describe the better established EU, and ASEAN as well, we find the suggestion that these organizations have already achieved a degree of acceptance as meaningful groupings. The word ‘sahaphap’ (‘union’ or ‘confederation’), which carries a considerably stronger sense of unity or cohesion than ‘prachakhom,’ is employed in the name ‘European Union’ (*sahaphapyurop*), or in ‘Soviet Union’ in the past. It is not used with reference to either the ‘Asia Pacific Community’ or the Japanese ‘East Asia Community.’ The term ‘samakhom’ (association) is also stronger, and is today used with

reference to ASEAN, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. It is an older word, carrying a sense of 'togetherness' or 'coming together.'

Where does this discussion of vocabulary take us? Most importantly perhaps, it points to the need to give priority to the social and cultural dimensions of regionalisation. The functionalist perspective – stressing the capacity of regional institutions to achieve practical results, particularly in the economic and security area – is without doubt vital. Nevertheless, the analysis of – and the actual process of – region building must start elsewhere, and with different disciplinary skills. The history of 'region' in Southeast Asia, particularly in contrast to the history of the component nation states, has been neglected. We need to know much more now about the inter-personal networks that developed in Southeast Asia – or across Southeast Asia to Japan, China and India. It is critical too to identify experiments in the conceptualizing of 'region,' noting variations in geographic scope and in perceptions of what regionalisation sought to entail in concrete terms. Such an historical project is likely to give prominence to the creativity of Japanese and Indian ideas as well as Southeast Asian entrepreneurs: given the long-term tendency of scholars to construct Southeast Asian history in terms of nation-state narratives this may come as a surprise. The Western colonial powers may have been central in the history of nation in Southeast Asian, but they would probably be less significant players in a true regional history.

In thinking about such a project, a further point deserves consideration. The intellectual construction of 'region' is one matter, but it is at least as challenging to analyse the emotive as the cognitive dimension of regionalism. I noted above the ASEAN Peoples' Assembly and the work of the ASEAN Committee on Social Development – and the way these developments are being discussed in Malaysia and Singapore. In 2003 ASEAN decided to create an ASEAN Political-Security Community; an ASEAN Economic Community; and an ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community. It will be essential to monitor the progress of that third Community, recognizing that the 'socio-cultural' is not peripheral but fundamental to the future significance of ASEAN. Because regional sentiment is something felt and not merely constructed conceptually – and because it must necessarily reach beyond elite groupings if it is to be politically potent – the investigation of ASEAN building will also need to delve into popular culture. Here sports have an obvious relevance, and one entry point for assessing their impact is to examine the Southeast Asian Games – held for the 26th time in November of last year, and including not only the 10 component states of ASEAN but also Timor-Leste. Analysing the emotion generated by sport, particularly the way it might help to promote a sense of 'We-ness,' will bring its own skillset challenges – some involving area knowledge, but others concerned with methodology.

References

- Acharya, Amitav. 2009a. *Whose Ideas Matter? Agency and Power in Asian Regionalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Asia Society. 2008. *Kevin Rudd: Towards an Asia-Pacific Union*. <http://www.asiasociety.org/policy-politics/governance/global/kevin-rudd-toward-asia-pacific-union> (accessed January 21, 2012).
- Bisley, Nick. 2009. *Building Asia's Security*. New York: Routledge.
- Cotton, James. 2006. ASEAN and Regional Institutions in the Asia Pacific: Ambitions vs Performance. In *Globalization and Regionalism: Views from the Pacific Rim*, edited by S. Lawson and W. Peake. pp. 73-111. Guadalajara: Universidad de Guadalajara.
- Eliassen, Kjell A.; and Arnesen, Catherine Berve. 2007. Comparison of European and Southeast Asian Integration. In *European Union and New Regionalism*, edited by Mario Telo. pp. 203-221. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Frost, Ellen L. 2008. *Asia's New Regionalism*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Goscha, Christopher E. 1999. *Thailand and the Southeast Asian Networks of the Vietnamese Revolution, 1885-1954*. Richmond: Curzon.
- Hau, Caroline S. 2011. Origins and Rise of the 'Anglo-Chinese.' *CSEAS Newsletter*, 63: 12-14.
- Hau, Caroline S.; and Shiraishi, Takashi. 2009. Daydreaming about Rizal and Tetcho. On Asianism as Network and Fantasy. *Philippine Studies*, 57(3): 329-388.
- Higgott, Richard. 2007. Alternative Models of Regional Cooperation? The Limits of Regional Institutionalization in East Asia. In *European Union and New Regionalism*, edited by Mario Telo, pp. 75-106. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Job, Brian L. 2009. Grappling with an Elusive Concept. In *Security Politics in the Asia-Pacific*, edited by William T. Tow, pp. 31-48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Karim, Wazir Jahan. 1990. Prelude to Madness: The Language of Emotion in Courtship and Early Marriage. In *Emotions of Culture: A Malay Perspective*, edited by Wazir Jahan Karim, pp. 21-63. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Kavi Chongkittavorn. 2011. Covering Asean for Three Decades. In *ASEAN Matters! Reflecting on the Association of Southeast Asian Nations*, edited by Lee Yoong Yoong, pp. 39-42. Singapore: World Scientific.
- Kumar, Sree; and Siddique Sharon. 2008. *Southeast Asia: the Diversity Dilemma: How Intra-regional Contradictions and External Forces are Shaping Southeast Asia Today*. Singapore: Select.
- Ping, Lee Poh; Yean, Tham Siew; and George T. Yu. 2006. *The Emerging East Asian Community: Security and Economic Issues*. Bangi: Pernerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

- Mandal, Sumit K. 2008. Collaboration and Community-making? A Case Study of an Asian Theatre Collaboration. In *Community in ASEAN: Ideas and Practices*, edited by Tham Siew Yean, Lee Poh Ping and Norani Othman. pp. 159-178. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Matichon Sutsapda* (Weekly Newspaper) 2009. October 23-29. p. 47.
- Milner, Anthony. 2003. Region, Security and the Return of History (*The Raffles Lecture*). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, pp. 1-59.
- . 2010. Localisation, Regionalism and the History of Ideas in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 41(3): 541-549.
- . 2011. Analysing Asian Regionalism: What Is an Architectural Perspective? *Australian Journal of International Affairs*. 65(1): 109-126.
- Navavan, Bhandumedha. 1999. *Khlang-kham*. Bangkok: Amarin Publishing.
- Pagden, Anthony, ed. 2002. *Idea of Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosaldo, Michelle Zimbalist. 1980. *Knowledge and Passion: Ilongot Notions of Self and Social Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Siddique, Sharon; and Kumar, Sree, eds. 2003. *The 2nd ASEAN Reader*. Singapore: ISEAS.
- Tarling, Nicholas. 2006. *Regionalism in Southeast Asia: To Foster the Political Will*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tham Siew Yean; Lee Poh Ping; and Norani Othman, eds. 2008. *Community in ASEAN: Ideas and Practices*. Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Thepchatree, Prapat. 2010. A Thai Perspective. In *Regionalism, An Asian Conversation: Three Viewpoints. Asia Link Essays 2010*. Vol. 2(4): 11-13. http://www.asialink.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0013/403060/Regionalism_An_Asian_Conversation29-6-2010.pdf (Accessed Jan 30, 2011).
- Wang Gungwu. 2006. Reflections on an East Asian Community. In *The East Asian Community: Security and Economic Issues*, edited by Lee Poh Ping, Tham Siew Yean and George T. Yu, pp. 58-70. Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan.
- Wunderlich, Jens-Uwe. 2007. *Regionalism, Globalization and International Order: Europe and Southeast Asia*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Notes

* I wish to acknowledge the assistance of Sheryn Lee, Amrih Widodo, Chintana Sandilands and Shahriman Lockman.

¹ The term 'regionalism' tends to suggest the intentional, top-down character of region building; 'regionalisation' focuses on the empirical fact of a growing density of interaction and cooperation (Job 2009: 38-39).

² See <http://www.aseansec.org/15159.htm>

From Bangkok to Palembang: The Southeast Asian Games and a Cultural Approach to Studying Regionalism

Simon Creak

Visiting Associate Professor CSEAS (Hakubi Project)

The 26th Southeast Asian (SEA) Games opened spectacularly in the South Sumatran city of Palembang, Indonesia, on the auspicious date of November 11, 2011. With a digital carpet (i.e. giant TV screen) covering the stadium field and almost half of the stadium converted into a monumental stage piled with LED screens and speaker-stacks, the sound and lights of the opening extravaganza blasted away pre-games corruption and mismanagement concerns – at least momentarily. As in such extravaganzas elsewhere, the show was rich in representations of history and culture. The principal theme was “Srivijaya: The Golden Peninsula,” referring to the ancient kingdom located near present day Palembang. This was an intelligent choice: not only do the Srivijaya and Golden Peninsula motifs relate to local and national history, but also to that of Southeast Asia and the SEA Games themselves, thereby reinforcing the theme of regionalism.

Yet despite regional cooperation having been a key theme since 1958, when the SEA Games were founded as the South East Asia Peninsular (SEAP) Games, the event has not figured in scholarship on regionalism and regional history in Southeast Asia. In one sense, this may be due to lingering ignorance of sport as a meaningful object of political, social, and cultural analysis, though in most parts of the world this has changed. Just as importantly, oversight of the games also points to the absence of culture from studies of regionalism and regionalization, which tend to be dominated by politics, international relations, and economics. Here I sketch the establishment of the SEAP Games and make some preliminary observations of how the event might enhance the study of Southeast Asian regionalism.

Founding the SEAP Games

The SEAP Games were the brainchild of Vice President of the Olympic Committee of Thailand, Luang Sukhum Naiyapradit, a modern-minded noble who in the 1930s had excelled at college sport in the United States. Luang Sukhum wanted to consolidate the increasingly regular sporting exchanges between Thailand and her neighbors in a regional multi-sport event similar to the Asian Games and Olympics, which many countries in the region were now participating in. These countries, he believed, possessed a similar climate and their people a similar “physical appearance” as well as comparable sporting prowess. Based on these similarities, he believed regional sporting games would help the countries to improve their sporting standards and further regional cooperation.



Southeast Asian spectacle: Palembang's Gelora Sriwijaya Stadium lights up during the opening ceremony of last November's SEA Games.



Flags of the 11 competing nations and the SEA Games Federation flag (third from right).

In May 1958, during the 3rd Asian Games in Tokyo, Luang Sukhum proposed the event to sporting officials from Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Malaya, and South Vietnam. The meeting ratified his proposal for a “Little Asian Games” called the South East Asia Peninsular Games, formed the SEAP Games Federation to oversee the event, and planned games for every second year between the Asian and Olympic Games. The inaugural event in 1959 was scheduled for Bangkok in recognition of Thailand's leadership role. Thailand proposed 12 sports for the first games, including athletics, which was made compulsory, and other international sports such as football, basketball, and boxing. In addition, the meeting proposed including the indigenous regional game of *takraw* (rattan ball) as a demonstration sport, and it later became a full medal sport. The meeting also reputedly

coined the term '*sepak takraw*,' a compound of the Malay and Thai names, which has since become the accepted international nomenclature. Although international sports were most common, the coinage and inclusion of *sepak takraw* injected regional content into the schedule.

In Tokyo and afterwards, Luang Sukhum and fellow officials reiterated the two major objectives of the SEAP Games. In an instrumental sense, they would enhance sporting standards in the participating countries, thus increasing their competitiveness in the Olympics and Asian Games. "Our teams are not strong....Our standards are low," Luang Sukhum stated bluntly, and the SEAP Games aimed to reverse this situation (*Bangkok Post*, May 26 1958, p. 6). Secondly, the SEAP Games were established for the purpose of promoting regional solidarity. OTC president General Praphat Charusathian, protégé of the Thai dictator Field Marshal Sarit Thanarat, heralded the event as a means of "better[ing] the already existing bonds of friendship among the various member nations of the Games" (*Bangkok Post*, May 12, 1958, p. 6).

A Regional Family

If organizers were enthusiastic about how the SEAP Games would further regional friendship, they were less explicit about the criteria for membership of this "family" (kinship terms were used frequently). Yet there were clearly two considerations. First and most obviously, the SEAP Games were limited to the countries of peninsular Southeast Asia. This principle was relaxed with the last-minute inclusion of Singapore in the 1959 games, which may have been a direct response to Cambodia's withdrawal, apparently due to its dispute with Thailand over the Preah Vihear/Phra Viharn temple (back in the news in recent years). Nevertheless, the peninsular principle remained fundamental until 1977, when the renamed SEA Games were expanded to Indonesia, the Philippines, and Brunei after communist Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia had withdrawn two years earlier.

Behind the geography, however, were history, politics, and historiography. In the Thai and Lao languages, the SEAP Games were also known as *kila laem thong*, the *laem thong* or Golden Peninsula Games. The term *laem thong* has much in common with Suwannaphum, a mythical "golden land" mentioned in Buddhist texts (and the name of Bangkok's airport, showing how poignant the motif remains). The "golden land" myth has different versions throughout Southeast Asia. In the Indonesian one, which featured in the 2011 opening ceremony, "Suwannadwipa" (golden island) was Sumatra. In the Thai case, intellectuals such as Luang Wichit Wathakan had spent the 1930s and 1940s asserting that the Golden Peninsula/Suwanaphum encompassed all of mainland Southeast Asia and, most importantly, that the martially superior Siamese had historically been the dominant power in the region. "Siam has become the heart of the Golden Peninsula, like Athens was the heart of Greece," wrote Luang Wichit, which had attracted other "races" to settle in there. "All of us on the Golden Peninsula are the same ... [but] the Siamese Thais are the elder brothers," opined one of his characters (Baker and Pasuk 2005: 129). Such irredentism, which was behind renaming Siam "Thailand" in 1939 and the country's invasion of

neighboring "lost territories" during World War II, had faded into a less aggressive expression of regional historical ties in the SEAP Games.

The second consideration, anticommunism, was more obviously political and contemporary. Although Burma and Cambodia were non-aligned, the remaining countries were steadfast allies of the United States. Under the young regime of charming but ruthless dictator, Field Marshal Sarit Thanarat, SEAP Games founder Thailand was the strongest American ally of all. Emphasizing the ideological stance of the event, the only communist country on the Golden Peninsula, North Vietnam, never participated, and the US Operations Mission in Bangkok was approached to help with facilities for the 1959 games.

Culture and Regionalism

The founding of the SEAP Games was a significant step in regional institution building. Although it was not the first regional event or body, predecessors such as the South East Asia League and Southeast Asian Treaty Organization were respectively short lived and had narrow strategic goals under the stewardship of the United States. The SEAP Games preceded the Association of Southeast Asia (1961) and Maphilindo (1963) as well as their more resilient successor, ASEAN (1967), and from the mid 1980s, the Indochinese countries rejoined the SEA Games well in advance of joining ASEAN. In 2007 Timor Leste also joined, reinforcing how the event fosters soft diplomacy.

More important than this diplomatic function, however, was the popular and cultural character of the event. Together with politicians like Praphat, the games involved thousands of ordinary people, from athletes and officials to spectators and fans following in the press. These human interactions, repeated biennially for over half a century now, have combined with cultural features of the format to give substance to the regional themes of the games.

A series of familiar symbols and rituals were adapted in 1959 to reinforce the theme of regional amity. The SEA Games flag featured a light blue background, representing "the water that surrounds, or the sky that covers the Southeast Asian Countries," with six interlocking "bright yellow gold rings ... intertwined to denote friendship, brotherly love and unity of purpose" (Bell 2003). The flame of the first SEAP Games in Bangkok was lit from torches brought from each of the competing nations, so that the games flame symbolically embodied the unity between them. Likewise, the athlete's oath was read as the national team captains draped the six national flags, symbolically unified, over a rostrum emblazoned with the six-ringed SEAP Games emblem. Also adopted were the Olympic procession and assembly of athletes, in which national teams enter the stadium and form ranks on the stadium field. By juxtaposing national and universal symbols, this display "expresses cooperative unity, though a unity of ordered segmentation" (MacAloon 1984: 252). The scale and spectacle of such rituals adds to their cultural force, and contrasts with the staid character of political and economic meetings.



Proud and excited: Lao women's petanque medalists, Palembang, November 2011.

Featuring modern technologies such as amplified sound, sports stadia, and the press – and last year's spectacular in Palembang demonstrated how much further the technology has come – these performances were much changed from those of Clifford Geertz's famous "theatre state." Yet Southeast Asian traditions of political performance surely helped create a captive audience for this kind of display (Creak 2010). Emphasizing these continuities, the opening and closing ceremonies in 1959 were overseen by none other than a young King Bhumibol, then enjoying the early years of the monarchy's Sarit-sponsored renaissance and the rebirth of the Thai theatre state.

Regionalism, Nationalism and Personal Experience

As in the Olympics and similar events, symbols, rituals, and spectacle have combined to reinforce the official theme of universalism. Also as in these events, however, nationalism rather than regionalism predominates in the sporting events themselves and media reporting, as well as in many of the most serious controversies: from Cambodia's withdrawal in 1959 to complaints in 2011 that Indonesia included obscure sports to boost their medal tally (a charge leveled at most hosts). Indeed, nationalism was central in Thailand's use of the Golden Peninsula motif in the founding of the SEAP Games.

At times the pervasiveness of nationalism seems to drown out regional themes almost entirely. But while press reports bemoan the absence of "ASEAN spirit," nationalism does not stop the games' from fostering regionalization, if this is taken to mean the increasing density of intraregional connections and flows. It would be wrong to reduce the event's impact to one of nationalism or regionalism; the SEA Games plainly promote both,

revealing a tension that lies at the heart of Southeast Asian regionalism more generally. The popular and cultural format of the event means that, in the SEA Games, this tension is not abstract but rooted in the personal experiences of participants – athletes, team officials, organizers, volunteers, spectators, etc. – particularly the types of personal interactions they experience and the emotions that their involvement triggers.

References

- Baker, Chris; and Pasuk Phongpaichit. 2005. *A History of Thailand*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bangkok Post*. May 12, 1958.
- Bell, Erik. 2003. "South East Asian Games Federation," February 13, 2003. (Accessed on January 25 2011). <http://flagspot.net/flags/int@seag.html>
- Creak, Simon. 2010. Sport and the Theatrics of Power in a Postcolonial State: The National Games of 1960s Laos. *Asian Studies Review* 34: 191-210.
- MacAloon, John. 1984. Olympic Games and the Theory of Spectacle in Modern Societies, In *Rite, Drama, Festival, Spectacle: Rehearsals toward a Theory of Cultural Performance*, edited by J. MacAloon. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1984.

Looking at the Past of the Mekong to Meet the Challenges of the Present

Sunait Chutintaranont

Director of Southeast Asian Studies Program, Chulalongkorn University

What can we learn from the past of the Mekong region? The lower Mekong is not only one of the most dynamic regions of Southeast Asia, but it is also becoming an increasingly important academic field. In this respect, the Mekong region must not be taken for granted and should be considered as an integral part of this growing field. In the conference, 'Transformation of the Human Landscape' held in Nov. 2011, by the Center for Southeast Asian Studies Kyoto University and the Institute of Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University, the Mekong played an integral role in discussions. It is here where I would like to flesh out some of the implications of what was discussed, mainly changing patterns of land-use, evolving infrastructure across the region, human re-settlement, migration and resources management.

Recently, we have seen a great deal of research on the lower Mekong, yet there has been a very limited amount of attention given to the Mekong's past and the relationship between its history and the present. It has been challenging for me to incorporate the historical aspects of the Mekong's past with present concerns; a challenge in how can we make connections between the past of the Lower Mekong and its present that could open up ways to consider possible solutions to several problems that the region now faces. What sorts of lessons can be learnt from the past and applied to the present situation of the Mekong? If we are able to find solutions by looking into the past maybe we can do something for the betterment of the present and the future.

One initial concern that requires attention is the use of terms. Before the arrival of the European colonial powers in the 19th century, the lower Mekong region, as a term, did not exist. It was fashioned during this period and then, as a concept, developed as the colonial powers extended their reach throughout the region. In mainland colonial Southeast Asia, Burma, Malaysia and Indochina were under the influence of European powers. The colonial authorities shaped new perceptions, understandings and expectations as well as created new knowledge about our 'own' region. What we have learnt about Mekong is first, the knowledge that was accumulated in the Western World and this extends to Southeast Asian history.

When I first started out with an interest in the history of the region, there were no Masters or Doctoral programs that taught regional history in Thailand and Southeast Asia and I was forced to go abroad to learn about my own region. As such, a perception, or better said, a way of thinking about the region was adopted from Western scholars, something which can be traced back to knowledge formation in the colonial period. The Mekong and Indochina region are certainly terms created in the West. Yet, if we go back before the arrival of the French, the

Mekong River itself had several names.

These never expressed the whole length of the upper and lower Mekong in terms of divisions. How was the Mekong expressed by different people who lived in its proximity? At the farthest limits of the river, the Tibetans called the river, *dza chu* (water of stone); the Chinese named it *lánkāng jiāng*, (turbulent river); and below China the Cambodians named it *tôn lé mékông* (great river). In Thailand and Laos it is known as *mae nam khong* (mother of waters) and the Vietnamese know it as *Sông Cửu Long* (nine dragons river). These names show that there is a tendency to see the river as one, rather than split it into the two parts it is identified as at present. If we have to trace back the history of the river, we really need a new perception of what the Mekong was before we see it in terms of parts belonging to different nations that it runs through now.

If we perceive other tributary river systems such as the Nile in Egypt as a gift to the peoples there, then the Mekong is undoubtedly our regional shared gift. The shared junction at the borders of Thailand, Myanmar and Laos, known as the Golden Triangle, was a key place for the French when they first started to explore the Mekong which led to the creation of the first maps. The Golden Triangle is an area where the boundaries between Thailand Myanmar and Laos blurred and looking back at the history of this particular area we can see that in the 10th century, an ancient Thai settlement known as *chiang saen* (the ancient city) existed close to this junction. The city is understood to be one of the older known polities that existed in the northern part of present day Thailand and functioned up until the early Bangkok period. What its presence tells us is that civilizations in the region flourished in close vicinity to the river itself. This is one starting point we can use to inquire into the Mekong. However going downstream we come across another kingdom that played a very significant role in history as of the 13th century, the Lan Xang Kingdom. At that time, the kingdom was home to a major city Luang Prabang. This was followed by the kingdom of Vientiane and then Champasak.

Fig. 1 shows the level of development of the Lan Xang civilization. If we travel further downstream, Champasak, in lower Laos, represented one of the oldest urban centers that existed in this particular area and was home to the culture known as *chên-là*. Looking back at earlier Southeast Asian history, we can see that other civilizations such as the kingdom of *Funan* preceded this one. What is significant about these is the remains of a temple that remains situated up in the mountains in the Champasak area, *Wat Phu*. What should be made clear here is that the growth of these civilizations that developed and ruled in the area, were sustained by their proximity to the river.



Fig. 1 Painting from the Colonial Period showing Vientiane.

There are many lessons that we can learn from how past civilizations lived along the river in the region and one other that deserves mention is the Angkorian civilization. Angkorian society emerged and developed in the early part of the 9th century and flourished until the 14th. Fig. 2 shows Angkor Wat, the largest of what were undoubtedly many temples that were constructed during the period. The complex also makes clear that its proximity to the Mekong River played a crucial role in the development of Southeast Asian Societies. Angkor or the great city is to the Northeast of the Ton Le Sap River, of which around 70–80% of the water came from the Mekong itself. In this respect, we should see the Mekong as a river of life which fostered civilizations in mainland Southeast Asia, and one which people in the past treated with great respect. How do we know this? A look at the names given to the river highlights the level of respect people had towards it. Thais, Laotians and Cambodians believed that the river is the home of *Nāga* (Fig. 3), a mythical animal/creator residing at the bottom of the river. The Chinese may not have shared the same belief but they did believe that a great serpent resided in the river. Vietnam also associated a dragon with the river. What these beliefs point to is that there was a certain sacredness embodied in the Mekong and all of these center around the idea of a creator who provided both prosperity and catastrophe.

Toward the end of the Angkor period of rule, one of the last rulers of the kingdom, Jayavarman VII was visited by a Chinese diplomat who left us with some notes from the past in the form of a diary. Zhou Daguan, made some interesting observations about the king stating that before he retires to sleep with his wife, he must first sleep with a female *Nāga*. Failing to do so would lead to a great calamity. We know from these small observations that people were showing great respect for the power of the rivers, but that it was ritualized through *Nāga* belief and worship, something shared by people in the lower Mekong region. The Mekong has survived for another 1,000 years up until the present and there is much that can be learnt from this past to help us understand it now.

If asked what I have learnt from looking at its history and how we could conceptualize it, a number of keywords are apparent the first being 'sharing'. The river was a public property and belonged to many people across many generations and was a shared economic resource. By people we do not just refer to those who ruled, but all those who shared an equal right to

share resources coming from the river. They shared similar values and beliefs that played out through their interactions with it. The other keyword which is conjured out of past interactions with the river is 'connectivity'. This keyword can be seen in a number of dimensions. People in the past were connected socially and culturally. Since the pre-Ankorian period the connection between the people of the Mun River in the northeastern part of Thailand to people in Champasak were connected and these would 'flow' into the central parts of Cambodia. If we trace the history of the *chen-la* kingdom back into the past, there is reference to a king called Chittasen. There is an inscription at the mouth of the Mun River in northern Thailand which makes reference to some of these connections. Some scholars have hinted that we can trace connections along the river between different kingdoms which should make us rethink how connectivity took place along the river in the past. This suggests that the river is not about one way traffic. Looking at Cambodian history we can see that its cultural influence extended 'upstream' to many places along the Mekong river, and may have also stretched beyond its adjacent boundaries.

During Jayavarman VII's rule, a royal path was created in many directions, almost reaching Sukhothai, an ancient northern Thai state, and we can see in architectural remains the influences of Srisatchanalai and Sukhothai. What this all suggests is connectivity stretching through these kingdoms along the Mekong between the inland people, the Thai and Laotians. If we trace back the legend of the founder of the Lan Xang kingdom, Fa Ngum, we can see that he had connections with the Angkorian king, through personal and cultural linkage. What I want to stress here is that there were activities that connected people in both the upstream and downstream regions. Another thing that needs to be kept in mind is that people connected themselves to the world beyond their boundaries, and this was one which flowed over into the supernatural world (as with the shared belief in *Nāga*). Through the image of the river as mother, it served as a holy focal point and was accorded respect. This kind of belief creates what can be said to be a pattern of relations between humans and nature which has disappeared from our modern societies.



Fig. 2 Aerial photo of Angkor Wat



Fig. 3 Various images of Naga

Sharing and connectivity are key words that come to us from the past, yet it is difficult to say to what extent they can be applied to our present circumstances. Framing the past through some statistics on the Mekong River can shed light on its role in the world. The Mekong is the third richest area of biodiversity in the world after the Amazon, and the Sabie River in Africa. It is home to 1,245 species of fish, and maybe as many as 1,700. The river zone consists of 795,000 km² of wetland and more than 70 million people rely on it for agriculture, fishing, transportation and rituals. Resources from the river feed more than 300 million Southeast Asian people. Yet, against this statistical backdrop, present sharing practices are undoubtedly decreasing. The river is no longer treated as a public property to increased upstream damming.

During the winter, snow at the upper parts of the Mekong melts off to feed into the river. An incredible volume of water flows down south at high speed. However, this sheer volume of water cannot enter into the sea and its flow reverses to stream back up north to fill the Ton Le Sap River. During the rainy season, this river size triples and it is at this time that fish enter the lake to spawn and lay eggs. This leads to the season where Cambodians can increase their fishing catches.

As the Mekong loses its public accessibility through its allocation as a hydropower source, the proliferation of dams on the river and its tributaries are causing increasing problems (Fig. 4). It is obvious that the river has become the property of the state and of private companies as it becomes dammed within the national boundaries of different nations. If we come back to a point I raised earlier, there is now no clear demarcation between the river's holiness and unholiness. It only exists as a utility resource for different nations and their needs. Now, when we think about the Mekong, we think of it in terms of the east-west corridors that have developed across the region. I don't deny that these corridors play an important role in the region. Yet, water is increasingly being controlled by fewer people and this will inevitably lead to clashes over resource use and access of a river that was once public property.

Thus, how can we practice sharing in this current climate? Serious emphasis on answering the dilemma posed by public

loss is necessary and looking back over the past of the Mekong region we can see that the water in the river and the river itself was seen as public property. This is not a call to destroy dams, but to seek harmony among the stakeholders across countries who manage and use its resources. How can we accomplish this? Under present circumstances, asking stakeholders to consider the connectivity that exists across and within the Mekong River. Thinking in terms of connectivity may offer us a strategy to allow people who share the same ideas and beliefs across the region to communicate, activate and build bargaining power across their own local communities and social arenas. In this respect, at a grass root level, NGOs must starting building local networks that spread across borders and create new channels that can counter the power of the state.

Finally, if people want to voice their own concerns over rights to water management, they require more connectivity across localities, countries and the region itself. This will become the arena which will allow people to do so. Yet, people were already connected in the past, and that by looking at our histories we may find clues as to how to meet the challenges of the present and our near future. We don't need to rely on all knowledge as it was used in the past, but yes, we can use its 'spirit' to form our strategies that will allow those who live from the Mekong to come to know it and its value: as a river recognized all over the world.



Fig. 4 Location of dams along the Mekong river

Gamelan in the Blood

Joss Wibisono

Former Visiting Research Fellow CSEAS

Senior Editor, Indonesian Service, Radio Netherlands Worldwide

Academics often overlook examining colonialism as a match-maker for musical genres. Yet in the case of gamelan (traditional music of Java and Bali) there are some interesting conjunctions with western classical music. Influences in the compositions of Eurasian composers were also born out of unexpected unions that developed through colonial encounters. Renowned composers such as the French composer Claude Debussy (1862–1918) watched and listened to Sari Oneng, an ensemble of Sundanese gamelan from West Java in Paris, and it is these influences which resonate in places in his repertoire.

How Debussy was influenced by gamelan is widely known, yet little is known about the new brand of Eurasian composers who, unlike Debussy, were more ‘natural’ in their encounters with the gamelan. Some were born in the Indies, lived and died there. However, these non-Europe-based composers were also educated in classical music, with one of them even making a visit to Leipzig to study at the famous conservatoire there. In the era of colonialism, other hitherto unknown composers and musicians lived under the shadow of Debussy’s encounter; these people produced compositions that enthusiastically incorporated gamelan into their music. However, this raises an interesting question: in contrast to Debussy, why was their use of the gamelan sound or structure not given the same attention as that which Debussy received? In other words, what is the significance of the lack of recognition in their influences in adding to Western classical music?

It is well known that in 1889, Debussy visited the Paris *Exposition Universelle* that commemorated the centenary of the French Revolution. The Dutch pavilion at the exhibition, called *Le kampong Javanais*, depicted a real Javanese village replete with inhabitants, yet it was not a state-sanctioned pavilion, as the queen as head of state, The Hague, had refused to take part in the celebration commemorating the demise of the French monarchy.

The result of this effort could be called an innovative mixture or, for those who were attached to tradition, a mixture of nonsense. While perhaps the village itself was a result of the excellent Batavian artisan work, the gamelan players who performed were not professionals. These could only be reached through official channels. The players of Sari Oneng were in fact, workers of the *Parakan Salak* tea plantation in Sukabumi, West Java. Interestingly, in Paris, they accompanied professional dancers from Mangkunegara, one of the courts of Solo in Central Java. A Dutch businessman with close palace connections managed to convince Mangkunegara’s authorities to dispatch four teenage female dancers. It is questionable whether he told the authorities the whole truth – that these dancers would



Pict.1 Two Javanese dancers at the base of the Eiffel Tower

Source: Denys Lombard (1992)

accompany a Sundanese gamelan led by the plantation’s owner, a Dutchman called Adriaan Holle. The fact that these dancers were called *tandhak* (street dancers) requires further research to clarify what their role was. One tends to speculate that they were not really palace dancers. Yet, combining Sundanese gamelan with Javanese dance is, to use a crude analogy, akin to a rock band accompanying ballroom dancers. Indonesians today would still raise their eyebrows at the idea of a collaboration between Sundanese gamelan and Solo court dancers.

That Debussy was mesmerized by Javanese gamelan is well documented (Fauser 2005; Bloembergen 2004). He was quite impressed by gamelan’s counterpoint, as can be read in one of his much quoted reviews of Sari Oneng: “Javanese music is based on a type of counterpoint by comparison with which that of Palestrina is child’s play” (Bloembergen 2004: 126). But the music he heard was not performed by a first-class gamelan ensemble and the combination with Solo’s court dance was far from the real thing as practiced in the day. One wonders how Debussy would have been impressed, had he been present at the first professional gamelan performance in Europe. A decade earlier, in 1879, the first professional gamelan ensemble performed in Europe, in the city of Arnhem, Holland. It was an ensemble of 13 musicians from the Mangkunegaran court of Solo (Cohen 2010: 10; Terwen 2009: 73–112). Would Debussy have been impressed by its counterpoint and not by other aspects? Solo’s

gamelan is certainly different from Sundanese gamelan such as *Sari Oneng*. The instruments are different, requiring different kinds of tuning and the Solo's ensembles have more instruments distinguishable by their very different repertoires. Debussy was, however convinced of his own musical language after listening to *Sari Oneng* and his compositions matured by incorporating these impressionistic influences, which are clearly audible in his work *Les Estampes No.1 Pagodes*. In this composition for piano solo, published in 1903, Debussy's accords are floating and never resolve. He achieves this by employing a pentatonic scale, which happens to be the scale of gamelan.

Paris would be host to other similar exhibitions in the years following the *Exhibition Universelle* of 1889 and Debussy's music would continue to be informed by the mix of musical influences brought to Paris. However, it was not only Debussy who was attracted to gamelan while visiting one or more exhibitions; other composers were also heavily influenced by the various exhibitions held in Paris. Francis Poulenc (1899–1963) was another prominent composer and in 1931 he visited the *Exposition Coloniale Internationale*, a six-month long event held in Paris where a Balinese gamelan ensemble from Peliatan performed. This was the first ever performance of Balinese gamelan abroad and one cannot miss the Balinese influence in Poulenc's concerto for two pianos in D minor. In 1944, Poulenc wrote his surrealist short opera *Les Mamelles de Tirésias* which also incorporated a Balinese motif at the end of the prologue.

Colin McPhee (1900–1964) is also a transitional figure who deserves mention. Not only did he watch Peliatan's gamelan in Paris, but he also visited Bali in the 1930s and stayed on the island for several years. McPhee belongs to a second group of composers—those influenced by native Indonesian music and had the opportunity to visit the Indies. The Balinese influence is clearly audible in most of his music. *Balinese Ceremonial Music for Two Piano or Lagu Delem. Tabuh-Tabuhan* (1936), for instance, sounds like a concerto of Balinese gamelan but is in fact performed by a western orchestra without a single gamelan instrument present.

The second group also includes the British composer Benjamin Britten (1913–76). Britten stayed in the same house as McPhee when he and his partner Peter Pears, both pacifists, lived in a self-imposed exile in New York during World War II. McPhee introduced the Balinese gamelan to Britten and both of them recorded some of McPhee's piano transcriptions. After the war Britten met Poulenc and the two composers were the soloists of Poulenc's concerto for two pianos in a performance at the Albert Hall in London, on January 16, 1955. A year later, in January 1956, Britten and Pears went to Bali to stay for several weeks.

Balinese influence was indistinctly audible in Britten's first opera, *Peter Grimes*, which he composed after returning from America and shade of Balinese music become more clearer in the music he created for the ballet *Prince of the Pagodas*, composed in 1956, the year he went to Bali. Most of all, full-fledged Balinese sounds are unmistakably audible in his last opera *Death in Venice*, based on Thomas Mann's novella (*Der Tod in Venedig* 1912).

Death in Venice is different from other Britten's operas and others in general. Although there is no distinctive aria in it, it is mainly about the protagonist's contemplation of his own life. As



Pict. 2 Constant van de Wall.



Pict. 3 Paul Seelig (At the left seated and holding a boy)

such, the opera is one long aria on the main character, Gustav von Aschenbach, a famous writer troubled by writer's block. Around half an hour into the opera, a scene plays out where Von Aschenbach encounters the Polish boy Tadzio. It is here that Britten employs the gamelan scale, which he later develops more fully through the opera. This is the Tadzio motif, a musical manifestation of a mute role in the opera. But there is more. The Greek god of music Apollo appears to Tadzio and his friends while they are playing games, a scene known as *the Games of the Apollo*. Apollo, a role for a countertenor, sings enchanting melodies employing the Balinese pentatonic scale. This is one of Britten's most ingenious inventions, since, unlike Javanese gamelan, the Balinese counterpart does not include much singing. *Death in Venice* as such places emphasis on singing, solo or in ensemble with the choir, distancing itself from the standard use of the gamelan in Bali.

The list of gamelan-influenced composers goes on to include other personalities such as Leopold Godowsky (1870–1938), Maurice Ravel (1875–1937), Olivier Messiaen (1908–92), Michael Tippett (1905–98), Lou Harrison (1917–2003), John Cage (1912–92), Steve Reich (1936–) and Philip Glass (1937–); all western composers who incorporated gamelan sounds, motives or structures into their compositions.

We have seen how gamelans from Sunda, West Java, and from Bali have inspired different Western composers yet gamelan music can be found throughout Java and Bali with different variations. So what about the gamelan from courtly Central Java of Yogyakarta and Solo where the Mataram kings still reign in the present? Here we will encounter the Eurasian composers, for they were mostly influenced by Javanese gamelan. They appear to predominately fall into two schools: those who stressed the importance of unfettered creativity and those who attached importance to sources employed in tradition. Constant van de Wall (1871–45) belongs to the first school and saw the gamelan as a mere source of inspiration for his own creative processes. The second, spearheaded by Paul Seelig (1876–1945), saw gamelan as more than just a source of inspiration; they were faithful to the gamelan tradition, and their compositions sound like original Malay, Sundanese or Javanese songs.

For Debussy, Gamelan convinced him to employ the pentatonic scale; he had been searching for something different and was perhaps tempted to use it before finally coming into contact with it at the Paris Exhibition. Such conviction was hardly needed by Constant van de Wall. For him Java was not only a depiction of village or kampong, but also of two big cities as well, Surabaya, his city of birth in 1871, and Semarang where he grew up. In Semarang, the capital of Central Java, we can be sure that Van de Wall heard gamelan on a daily basis. It is not surprising that he considered himself one of the composers whose “exoticism is in their blood, to such an extent that they do not need to borrow native melodies and motives” (Van de Wall 1928). Almost all of his compositions expound Javanese musical elements and he considered himself as being more familiar with Javanese gamelan than any other outsider could ever be.

In a sense, he was right. In *Rhapsodie Javanaise II* (1930) Van de Wall revealed his unrivalled understanding of gamelan. This composition for piano solo starts in *sléndro* and continues in *pélog*, the two scales of Javanese gamelan. These can be regarded as the equivalent to major and minor scales in western music. The theme, in *pélog*, sounds so distinctive that no ear can mistake it for purely western music. Debussy was not aware of the two scales in Javanese gamelan, as 19th century Sundanese gamelan such as Sari Oneng did not differentiate between scales. Van de Wall also composed *Jeu d'ombres* (1918), an art song in French and Dutch about Javanese shadow puppets, which is probably the only song about this tradition for Javanese theater. Javanese gamelan motives are scattered all over this composition for middle voice accompanied by piano, and it also contains some Debussy-like accords.

In his major work, the opera *Attima* which premiered on January 8, 1917 in The Hague, van de Wall demonstrates his extensive knowledge of Javanese culture. More importantly, as this opera deals with a group of Javanese dancers, van de Wall

breaks through the strict distinction between opera and ballet. Opera is commonly known as a singing art while ballet focuses on dancing. In overcoming the separation between these two art forms, van de Wall made use of the Javanese form of theatre *wayang wong* (human wayang) in a ‘western’ opera. Not only are *wayang wong* players supposed to act and sing, they must also master *bekso* (the Javanese dance). By composing music for a drama about Javanese dancers, van de Wall successfully merges two distinct forms of art, opera and ballet. Living in Nice, south of France, toward the end of his life, van de Wall was known as *compositeur javanais* or Javanese composer and although he had a typically sounding Dutch name, this title came to epitomize his knowledge and understanding of Javanese culture.

Paul Seelig was not born in the Indies, but he spent most of his life in Java and died of exhaustion after being released from a Japanese prison camp in Batavia in June 1945. Being educated in Leipzig, Germany, Seelig had spent most of his life in Asia, hopping from one South East Asian court to another. Firstly he was active in Solo, and then he moved to Bangkok and Johor before finally settling down in Bandung.

Pakoe Boewono X of Solo appointed Paul Seelig in 1899 to set up a palace symphony orchestra and he had to start from scratch, practically training every single musician. Yet, a year later the 20-member orchestra performed for the first time. Seelig was satisfied by the response of an enthusiastic audience and at the time noted “the players played properly and admirably,” (Mak van Dijk 2007: 157). In its heyday the orchestra consisted of 90 players and during his time at the palace Paul Seelig managed to collect 200 gamelan themes, which he published as *Gending Jawi* (1922).

Most probably, during his Solo years Seelig was introduced to King Rama V of Siam when he visited his Javanese counterpart Pakoe Boewono X in June 1901. Also another possibility is that Seelig was introduced to the King’s son, Prince Paribatra, later known as the father of western classical music in Thailand. The fact is that, at the invitation of the King, Seelig went to live in Bangkok for the second half of 1910. This was followed by several visits during which he stayed for several months at a time in Bangkok. Seelig also studied Siamese music, which he later published as a collection, as well as his *Rhapsodie siamoise* (1932). He also orchestrated *Maha Chay*, Thailand’s Royal Anthem for a complete orchestra. Although his Johor connections still need further research, Seelig composed a collection of five lieder (German art song), and his Opus 7, entitled *Fünf Lieder* (Malayische lieder) published around 1902, was dedicated to Her Royal Highness Sultanah Khatijah of Johor.

He eventually chose to settle in Bandung and established a music publishers company Matatani, which disseminated many of his works, among which were songs with piano accompaniment (e.g. *Tembang Sunda*, *Tembang Tjitro Kusomo Sekar*, *Djalak Idjo*, *Hastaka Kuswala*), piano solo pieces (*Danse de Masque javanaise*, *Pentul Tembem*), a music drama (*Dewi Anggraeni*), a piano concerto in F-sharp minor, and many more.

In a pioneering book, the Dutch pianist and anthropologist Henk Mak van Dijk (2007) devotes special chapters not only to Seelig and Van de Wall, but also Linda Bandara (1881–1960) and Bernhard van den Sigtenhorst Meyer (1888–1953). He also

mentions Theo Smit Sibinga (1899–1958), Daniel Ruyneman (1886–1963), Frans Wiemans (1889–1935), Hector Marinus (1902–52), Berta Tideman-Wijers (1887–1976) and a few more hitherto unknown composers who have all lived under the shadow of Debussy's influences.

Historically, Debussy's role is unquestionable as a pioneer of musical impressionism, partly thanks to his encounter with the Sundanese gamelan of Sari Oneng performed in Paris. But for the Indonesian music history other Eurasian composers have by far, played a more prominent role. They are unmistakably the first to have composed a unifying music of East and West and thus succeeded in creating a unique musical fusion. However, the question remains as to why these Eurasian composers never attained the same acclaim as Debussy or other composers who encountered gamelan in Europe?

One important answer is that firstly, among Eurocentric Dutch music critics, there was little or no appreciation of them in comparison to "home grown" Dutch composers. In fact van de Wall's quote earlier is taken from his essay entitled "*Een Causerie over Indische Muziek en Indische componisten*" (a lecture about music of the Indies and Eurasian composers), published in the daily *Het Vaderland* in 1928 in which he tried to defend why he employed gamelan scales and motives.

Another answer is Holland's role in the European power game. This seemingly distant factor from the world of music had a great impact on Eurasian composers in the sense that their work "became unknown" due to the fact that, among others, Holland had and still has little influence in Europe. This fact did not change notably in the possession of her colonies, no matter how big they were. His own artistic quality notwithstanding, Debussy's fame was also due to the fact that France was and still is influential in the world. If we consider the influence of the Paris Exhibition, despite the fact that a second-class gamelan ensemble performed there, two centuries later it is still in the public memory, rather than the National and Colonial Industrial Exhibition held in Arnhem in 1879, where the first ever Javanese professional gamelan ensemble performed in Europe.

Colonialism can be a catalyst for creating a marriage between different musical genres, as that which occurred between gamelan and Western classical music. Regrettably, however, Dutch colonialism, while teeming with such marriages, failed to generate sufficient appreciation and public awareness of their offspring and led to the burial of a large body of music influences. These require a more detailed inquiry to clarify the musical convergences that arose through colonial encounters. These can deepen our knowledge of the different forms of exchange that took place in Europe's colonial entanglements in Southeast Asia.

References

- Bloembergen, Marieke. 2004. *Koloniale Inspiratie, Frankrijk, Nederland, Indië en de wereldtentoonstellingen 1883-1931*. Leiden: KITLV Uitgeverij.
- Cohen, Matthew Isaac. 2010. *Performing Otherness Java and Bali on International Stages, 1905-1952*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cooke, Mervy. 1998. *Britten and the Far East, Asian Influences in the Music of Benjamin Britten*. Suffolk: The Boydell Press.
- Fausser, Annegret. 2005. *Musical Encounters at the 1889 Paris World's Fair*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press.
- Lombard, Denys. 1992. Le Kampong Javanais à l'Exposition Universelle de Paris en 1889. *Archipel*, Vol. 43: 115–130. doi:10.3406/arch.1992.2810, (Accessed on November 10, 2011). http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/arch_0044-8613_1992_num_43_1_2810
- Mak Van Dijk, Henk. 2007. *De oostenwind waait naar het westen: Indische componisten, Indische composities, 1898-1045*. Leiden: KITLV Uitgeverij.
- Terwen, Jan Willem. 2009. *Gamelan in the 19th Century Netherland, An Encounter Between East and West*. Utrecht: KVMN.
- van de Wall, Constant. 1928. "Een causerie over Indische muziek en Indische componisten." Published in daily *Het Vaderland*, April, 26 1928.

From Story to Shrine

Chris J. Baker and Pasuk Phongpaichit
Visiting Research Fellows CSEAS

Khun Chang Khun Phaen (*KCKP*) is a folk epic in Thai and first developed in an oral tradition of storytelling for local audiences, possibly from around 1600. It was later adopted by the Siamese royal court, written down, probably from the 18th century, and first printed in 1872. The plot is a love triangle which ends in high tragedy when the heroine is executed by the king. Unlike most Thai classics which recount the fantastic exploits of gods and kings, *KCKP* is about ordinary people in realistic situations. Like other classics which began in oral tradition (*Odyssey*, *Iliad*, *Mahabharata*, *Ramayana*, *Heike Monogatari*, etc.), the repeated interplay between performers and audiences over centuries instilled the work with messages and meanings that are universal and eternal. To this day, *KCKP* lives on in adaptations as novel, film, TV drama, comic book, temple mural, and stage play.

Some characters in *KCKP* live on in another way. They have entered the realm of the spirits, and have devotees who hope to tap their special powers to solve everyday problems.

The hero of the tale, Khun Phaen, grows up in Old Kanburi, a town that was destroyed and abandoned in the late 18th century. At the foot of Cockfight Hill, the sacred hill overlooking the old town site, there is a shrine to Khun Phaen and his father, Khun Krai.



Pict.1 Khun Phaen and Khun Krai, folk images.



Pict. 2 Khun Phaen and Khun Krai, by the military, and cock offerings.

According to a notice in the shrine, the original images were created by local villagers around 1950. Khun Phaen has a sword and a military helmet. Khun Krai is white-haired and more simply attired in a lowercloth and tunic with an embroidered neck. More recently, the shrine has been adopted by the army. Both Khun Phaen and his father were soldiers. There are several military camps nearby. The army has contributed two bronze images in a style similar to other recent heroic historical statuary (e.g., King Naresuan in Phitsanulok). The figures have cropped



Pict. 3 Khun Phaen as governor of Kanburi.

hair, moustaches, and tight tunics. They are seated on low stools with one leg tucked up, and they have a stern military air.

The army has also completely rebuilt the shrine. All the images are now housed in a concrete pavilion with marble trimming, officially opened in 1994 by no less than the Commander-in-Chief of the Royal Thai Army, General Wimol

Wongwanich and a plaque commemorates the event. While we were there on two visits, a car stopped every fifteen minutes or so, and people paid respect. Dolls of fighting cocks are available for purchase as offerings—an obvious reference to Cockfight Hill.

Beside the road entering Old Kanburi, there is a shrine to Khun Phaen as governor of Kanburi, a post he assumes at the very end of the main tale. The shrine is a small simple structure



Pict. 4 King Chulalongkorn beside Khun Phaen

made of brick, cement and plaster. Khun Phaen wears a brilliant yellow jacket and a blue prostration cloth at his waist, a mark of status. He is surrounded by many attendant figures including alluring women, horses, and elephants—references to his career in the tale as a soldier and lover. On his right, the striking figure is King Chulalongkorn in a red jacket. Between our visits in 2007 and 2009, another image of the same king was added, plus some other figures which are clearly royal but difficult to identify. Unfortunately the painters were very careless with the



Pict. 5 Simala Fort in Old Phichit

whitewash and all these figures have been rather disrespectfully splattered.

Early one morning while we were there, a BMW drew up. The driver knelt in front of the image for around five minutes and then drove away to whatever task awaited him that day.

In the tale, Khun Phaen and his son travel north commanding an army to attack Chiang Mai. When they stop at Phichit, the son falls in love with Simala, the daughter of the governor and they later marry.



Pict. 6 Simala in Old Phichit

The old town of Phichit was located close to the ancient, 12th-century city of Sa Luang (Great Lake), about 10 km from modern Phichit. At the northeast corner of the site is a sign to *pom simala*, Simala Fort. On what was probably a bastion on the walls of the ancient city, there is a simple hut on stilts, similar to traditional village houses in the Chaophraya plain. There is no other structure anywhere near.



Pict.7 Buakhli at Wat Ban Tham, Kanchanaburi



Pict. 8 Goldchild and attendants

Inside, Simala sits in a very bare room. The image is rather well done—pretty, bright, supple, relaxed and assured and the other few attendants are standard figures. The mass of burnt-out incense sticks show that the shrine is in everyday use.

In a 19th-century addition to the tale, Khun Phaen marries and then murders a woman, Buakhli, in order to create a personal spirit from the fetus of their unborn child. This episode takes place in a bandit lair at Ban Tham (Cave Village), 5 km southeast of Kanchanaburi. The site is very dramatic. The cave is up a steep hillside overlooking the Maeklong River. A naga staircase leads to the entrance, past a series of murals relating the whole Buakhli episode in the tale. Buakhli is painted on the base of a stalagmite. She is dressed in a beautiful outfit, clearly renewed at regular intervals.

Beside her is her son-turned-spirit, the kuman thong, Goldchild, beautifully dressed in a gold outfit with an elaborate collar. The attendants include the usual elephants and votive ladies but also a large number of superhero characters and several toy vehicles including a mobile crane.

The villagers of Ban Tham proudly believe that they are descendants of Buakhli's father, a bandit chief. They now sell gravel dug from pits nearby. Maybe that explains their toy crane. We were told there were bi-monthly rituals honoring Buakhli. This shrine is obviously meticulously kept.

These shrines and images were locally made. They are in constant everyday use. As far as we know, no other old Thai literary work has characters honored in shrines in this way. Why is *Khun Chang Khun Phaen* different? Probably because people believe that the tale was told from true events and its characters were real people who became spirits after death in the usual way. Characters in other Thai literary works are not the same. Either the stories came from elsewhere (*Three Kingdoms*, *Inao*, *Jatakas*, etc.) and so the spirits are elsewhere, or the stories are obviously fantastic inventions about fictitious characters.

By appearing in the tale and thus acquiring a kind of immortality, these characters become powerful figures that can be implored for assistance in everyday life.

These characters are also expressions of localism. Like Ya Mo in Khorat or the Phuket sisters, they are figures whose fame



Pict. 9 Nang Phim (Wanthong) at Wat Palelai, Suphanburi

has become national—largely because of schoolbook history and schoolbook literature. They are therefore powerful as symbols of local identity precisely because their meaning and their local association is understood beyond the locality, indeed at a national level.

There seem to be no shrines to two of the tale's three major characters, Khun Chang or Wanthong. Khun Chang is understandable because he is a very negative character. At Wat Palelai in Suphanburi there is an image of Wanthong that probably came from folk origin and was later imported into the wat. But we have not seen a shrine to Wanthong like those of Simala and Buakhli.

In an episode probably added to the tale in the 19th century, Wanthong returns to this world in the form of a *pret* or *asurakai*, a spirit that has been stranded in the netherworld on account of her burden of bad deeds. This episode condemns Wanthong as a bad woman whose spirit is turbulent and malevolent. Perhaps this is why she is not enshrined like other characters from the tale.

Note

We began our English translation of *Khun Chang Khun Phaen* while at the Center in 2004. It was published by Silkworm Books in 2010.

The Library as Reflection of Southeast Asian Studies History

Kitamura Yumi
Assistant Professor CSEAS

The idea of building a library or a collection is probably one of the most common practices for academic institutions when they are first established. Yet, along with the process towards the establishment of a new institution, a library or a collection must also be imagined, planned, and established. The history of a library, therefore, will inevitably reflect the history of its institution. In the case of a new discipline such as area studies, libraries are also records which reflect the history of the discipline itself. The purpose of this essay is to look into the major Southeast Asian library collections in the United States in association with how Southeast Asian Studies in the United States were developed and compare with the paths taken by Japanese counterpart.

The term Southeast Asia was a geo-political concept that emerged after the World War II as a result of the United States recognizing the importance of the region during the Cold War period against the Soviet Union and China. Southeast Asian programs were established in the United States and rose from within this global context, first at Yale University in 1947, followed by Cornell University in 1951. Both programs received financial support from the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations.

Library collections holding reference materials on Southeast Asia were a critical component of these programs. At Yale University, the main library had begun collecting materials from Southeast Asia as far back as 1899 when Clive Day was hired to teach about the region. Cornell University library, on the other hand, was fortunate to have Professor John M. Echols whose close collaboration with another curator, Giok Po Oey (Anderson 2009: 73-74) led to the rapid growth of a Southeast Asia collection that would later be named in his honor. Another major collection took shape at the Library of Congress, which used its allocations under the Public Law 480 program in 1963 to conduct a survey in Indonesian that would guide its acquisition program in close collaboration with 12 research libraries in that

country (Library of Congress 1964: 2)¹.

Individual institutions, through various approaches, and the efforts of staff and faculty members contributed to the library collection and formation of the discipline. This led to creation of a national network that possessed acquisition protocols similar to those in Europe and Japan (Wada 2007: 147-150, 183-213).

These programs played a role in creating a larger picture of the development of south and southeast Asian Studies in the United States based on the emerging importance of the region. In 1949, The Joint Committee on Southern Asia was established under the collaboration of Council of Learned Society and Social Science Research Council to promote Southern Asian Studies (including Southeast Asia) in the United States where post WWII pressure from the Cold War became more intense. The committee was sponsored by the Carnegie foundation at the beginning and conducted a survey to draft a 10 year plan (FAO 1952). One important component in this plan is the establishment of good library collections.

The Japanese however paid close attention to the rise of area studies on South and Southeast Asia in the U.S. The outcome of the Joint Committee on *Southern Asian Studies in the United States: A Survey and Plan* American was quickly translated by Japanese FAO only a year after its original publication in 1951.

Soon after, in 1965, Southeast Asian Studies became institutionalized in Japan with the establishment in 1958 of the Institute of Developing Economy and the Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS). Both institutions were primarily research-oriented, but also engaged in some educational training. CSEAS soon developed an institutional identity based on an attempt by Japanese scholars to distinguish themselves from their American counterparts, and the effort to show a distinctive identity remains important to this very day. Japanese criticism of the way area studies was being conducted in the United States

became more accentuated after the end of the Cold War. In particular, after the Vietnam War, Southeast Asian Studies in the U.S. was criticized for the relationship between policy making and the necessity of non-policy oriented area studies (Yano 1986). On the other hand, the libraries of the U.S. institutions kept serving as ideals of Southeast Asian collections.

If we compare the steps taken by the U.S. institutions towards the libraries, there appears to be a disconnection between the vision towards academic achievement and library development in the case of Japanese Southeast Asian Studies. This disconnection can be partly explained by the failure of implanting American idea of libraries and librarianship planned by the Civil Information and Education Section (CIE) under General Head Quarters, Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers (GHQ/SCAP). Because libraries in the U.S. obtained recognition as intellectual devices in the 1940s, the CIE tried to apply the American concept of libraries and set up the professional schools in Japanese higher education to train librarians (Nemoto 1993)². However, the five years of GHQ occupation period was not enough to plant the seeds of American type librarianship in Japanese soil.

In the near future, I hope to further explore the lacuna in the development of the library component in both U.S. and Japan's top Southeast Asian Studies institutes. I plan to adopt the methodology developed by Wada, who examined how the Japanese collections in the United States were formed by conducting a series of comprehensive oral interviews with involved archival research, examining reports and publications on collections, and evaluating acquisition lists and collections. This "history of literacy" approach, as he calls it, enabled Wada to capture not only the origins of each collection, but also the complex socio political context behind them. In addition, Wada has also described the development of librarianship specializing in Japanese collections in the United States and how the meaning of a given collection has changed over the years. By following his footsteps in the case of Southeast Asian Studies, I am hoping to find not only the history of Southeast Asian Studies and its relation to the library collection, but also the unspoken definitions of libraries and librarianship in both U.S. and Japanese academic environments. To do so will allow us to be more reflexive about how our collections are not just created, but institutionally imagined too.

References

- Anderson, Benedict. 2009. *Yashigarawan no Soto he* (Jumping out of the Coconut Cup). Translated by Kato Tsuyoshi and published only in Japanese. Tokyo: NTT.
- Kokusai Shokuryo Nogyo Kyokai [FAO]. 1952. *Amerika Gasshukoku ni okeru Nanpo Ajia no Kenkyu: Kosatsu to Kenkyu Keikaku* (Southern Asia studies in the United States: a survey and plan. 1951. Philadelphia: Joint Committee on Southern Asia.) Tokyo: Kokusai Shokuryo Nogyo Kyokai.
- Nemoto, Akira. 1993. *Senryoki Toshokan Seisaku Kenkyu no Igi to Hoho* (Research on Library Policy during the Occupation Period: Its Significance and Methodology). In *Senryoki Toshokan Kenkyu no Kadai* Vol.1. Tokyo: Library & Information Laboratory, Graduate School of Education, University of Tokyo.
<http://plng.p.u-tokyo.ac.jp/text/senryoki/report98/nemoto.html> (Accessed February 1, 2012).
- Library of Congress. 1964. *Report of the Library of Congress, 1964*. Washington: Library of Congress.
- . 1965. *Report of the Library of Congress, 1965*. Washington: Library of Congress.
- Wada, Atsushi. 2007. *Shomotsu no Nichibei Kankei: Riterashishi ni Mukete* (Japan- US Relations Through Books: Towards the Establishment of a History of Literacy). Tokyo: Shinyosha.
- Williamson, William. 1967. *The Impact of the Public Law 480 Program on Overseas Acquisitions by American Libraries, Proceedings of a Conference Held at Wisconsin Center* (Madison, May 12 1967). Madison: Wisconsin University.
- Yano, Toru. 1986. *Reisen no Kozo* (Structure of the Cold War). Tokyo: Chuokoron.

Notes

¹ The Public Law 480 Program originates from the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Acts of 1954 or Food for Peace Program in 1954 which specified the use of currency earned through the sales of excessive agricultural products from US in countries with a food shortage to be spent in that country. In response to requests from groups of scholars, the program was amended in 1958 and began to be used to acquire print materials from targeted countries. The first program was launched in India, Pakistan, and Israel for the libraries in the United States under the initiative of the Library of Congress (Library of Congress 1965: xix-xv, Williamson 1967: 2-5)

² Namoto's discussion is mainly based on the public libraries, but refers to the overall library policy of CIE and its unintended consequences as well.

Websites

- Center for Southeast Asian Studies. (Accessed on July 5, 2011). www.cseas.kyoto-u.ac.jp
- Cornell University Library. History of Echols Collection on Southeast Asia. (Accessed on July 5, 2011).
<http://asia.library.cornell.edu/ac/Echols/Collection-History>

Publications



Kyoto CSEAS Series of Asian Studies No. 4 (in English)

China and the Shaping of Indonesia, 1949-1965

Hong Liu, 2011.

Hong Liu's *China and the Shaping of Indonesia* provides a meticulous account of versatile interplay between knowledge, power, ethnicity, and diplomacy in the context of Sino-Indonesian interactions between 1949 and 1965. Taking a transnational approach that views Asia as a flexible geographical and political construct, this book addresses three central questions. First, what images of China were prevalent in Indonesia, and how were narratives about China construed and reconstructed? Second, why did the China Metaphor - the projection of an imagined foreign land onto the local intellectual and political milieu - become central to Indonesians' conception of themselves and a cause for self criticism and rediscovery? Third, how was the China Metaphor incorporated into Indonesia's domestic politics and culture, and how did it affect the postcolonial transformation, the fate of the ethnic Chinese minority, and Sino-Indonesian diplomacy? The study is a major contribution both to the intellectual and political history of Indonesia and to the reconceptualization of Asian studies; it also serves as a timely reminder of the importance of historicizing China's rising soft power in a transnational Asia.

Visiting Fellows

CSEAS is accepting applicants semiannually for about 14 positions for scholars and researchers who work on Southeast Asia, or any one of the countries in that region, to spend 3 to 12 months in Kyoto to conduct research, write, or pursue other scholarly activities in connection with their field of study. Since 1975, more than 270 distinguished scholars have availed themselves of the Center's considerable scholarly resources and enjoyed the invigorating atmosphere of scenic Kyoto, the ancient capital of Japan and the main repository of the country's cultural treasures, to pursue their interests in Southeast Asian Area Studies. The Center's multi-disciplinary character and the diverse research interests of its faculty offer visiting scholars an ideal opportunity for the exchange of ideas and the cultivation of comparative perspectives. The highly competitive selection process has brought to the Center in recent years researchers from Southeast Asian countries, Bangladesh, China, Korea, and western countries including the United States and France. The visiting fellows represent various basic disciplines in their study of Southeast Asia, and their official posts in their

home institutions include teacher, researcher, librarian, journalist, and NGO worker. Information and Technology (IT) experts who conduct research on Southeast Asia are also joining the Center, not only to manage various database systems but also to construct academic networks for area study throughout the world.

Successful applicants receive an appropriate stipend to cover international travel, housing, and living expenses in Kyoto. Research funds will also be provided to facilitate his/her work. Funds will also be allocated for domestic travel, subject to government regulations, and a number of other facilities are available to visiting scholars. Fellows will be expected to reside in Kyoto for the duration of their fellowship period. Fellows are normally invited to deliver a public lecture during their term at the Center and encouraged to submit an article for possible publication in the Center's journal, *Southeast Asian Studies* and to contribute to the online journal *Kyoto Review of Southeast Asia*. CSEAS also received researchers, both Japanese and foreign, who visit on their own funds or on external fellowships.

Name	Period	Affiliation/Position	Research Topic
Baker, Christopher John	11.01.2011-4.30.2012	Freelance Researcher	Land, Population, and State in Siam, 1600 to Present
Phongpaichit, Pasuk	11.02.2011-4.30.2012	Chairperson, Political Economy Centre, Faculty of Economics, Chulalongkorn University	Determinants of Wealth Concentration in Thailand
Feener, Roy Michael	1.4.2012-6.30.2012	Associate Professor, National University of Singapore	Shari'a and Social Engineering: The Implementation of Islamic Law in Contemporary Aceh
Praneel, Kiriyanant	1.11.2012-6.30.2012	Library Coordinator, AIT Library, Asian Institute of Technology	Survey of Open Source Integrated Library System in Thai University Libraries in Bangkok and Pathum Thani
Jeon, Je Seong	2.1.2012-7.31.2012	Associate Professor, Department of Political Science and Diplomacy, Chonbuk National University	Two Types of Labor Politics in East Asian Democracies: A Comparative Analysis of Indonesia and Korea
Heryanto, Ariel	3.1.2012-6.30.2012	Associate Professor and Head of Southeast Asia Centre Institute, School of Culture, History & Language, The Australian National University	Popular Cultures in Indonesia: a New Asian Politics of Pleasure and Identity
May, Damian Gerard	10.1.2011-10.13.2011	Research Scientist, SARDI (South Australian Research & Development Institute) Food Safety	Learning a Rapid and Easy Method for Detection of <i>Vibrio parahaemolyticus</i> in Molluscan Bivalves.
Aryana Satrya	11.24.2011-12.20.2011	Head of Institution, Laboratorium of Management Study, Department of Management, Faculty of Economics, University of Indonesia	Assessing Effective Union Strategy in Asia: Case of Japan
Antolihao, Lou Apolinario	11.29.2011-09.27.2013	N.A	Tourism Development, Local Livelihood Systems, and the Impact of the East ASEAN Growth Area Initiative.
Ida Nurlaila	2.13.2012-3.24.2012	Researcher at School of Architecture, Planning and Policy Development, Bandung Institute of Technology	The Institution and Technology of the Development of Bio-energy.
Malitz, David Michael	3.1.2012-2.28.2013	Ph.D. Candidate, Ludwig-Maximilians University, Munich	Nation, Monarch and Religion: A Comparison of the Official Nationalisms of Modern Japan and Thailand
Kam, Suan Pheng	3.18.2012-5.17.2012	Senior Scientist, The World Fish Center, Penang, Malaysia	Evaluating if Integrative and Participatory Approaches Lead to Pro-people and Sustainable Agriculture Development
Agustinus Danang Fajar	1.13.2012-3.30.2012	Research Assistant, Center of Management and Business Studies, Faculty of Economics, Universitas Padjadjaran	Green Marketing
Rizky Ramadhan Suryanto	2.5.2012-3.26.2012	Student at Graduate School of Development Studies, Bandung Institute of Technology	Role of Railway in the Development: Comparative Study between Japan and Indonesia
Dzulri Sriadana Sabianti	2.14.2012-3.30.2012	2nd Year of Master's Program, School of Architecture, Planning and Policy Development, Bandung Institute of Technology	The Prospect of Nyamplung in Poverty Alleviation
Suh, Jiwon	2.1.2012-7.31.2012	Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Political Science, Ohio State University	The Politics of Transitional Justice in Post-New Order Indonesia

List of Visiting Research Fellows, Visiting Researchers, and Visiting Project Researchers at CSEAS

CSEAS



SOUTHEAST ASIAN STUDIES

Launch of new *Southeast Asian Studies*, published by the Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University

In April 2012, CSEAS re-launches *Southeast Asian Studies* as an all-English journal. Intended for a regional as well as global readership, *Southeast Asian Studies* will be published three times a year.

The new journal aims to promote excellent, agenda-setting scholarship and provide a forum for dialogue and collaboration both within and beyond the region. *Southeast Asian Studies* engages in wide-ranging and in-depth discussions that are attuned to the issues and debates within the region, while affirming the importance of learning and sharing ideas on a cross-country, global, and historical scale. An integral part of the journal's mandate is to foster scholarship that is not just empirically grounded and multidisciplinary, but capable of bridging the continuing divide in area studies between the social sciences and humanities, on the one hand, and the natural sciences, on the other. To this end, the journal includes accessibly written articles that build on insights and cutting-edge research from the natural sciences.

Inquiries: english-editorial@cseas.kyoto-u.ac.jp



Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University 46 Shimoadachi-cho, Yoshida Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8501 Japan
Tel: +81-75-753-7302 Fax: +81-75-753-7350
京都大学東南アジア研究所 〒606-8501 京都市左京区吉田下阿達町46 Tel: 075-753-7302 Fax: 075-753-7350

Editors: Mario Lopez, Shitara Narumi, Kobayashi Sumiko, Ishikawa Noboru
〈編集〉マリオ・ロペス 設楽成実 小林純子 石川 登

Date of Issue: 31.03.2012

ISSN 2185-663X